



Bequest of
Rev. H. C. Scadding, D.D.
to the Library
of the
University of Toronto
1901

HANDBOUND
AT THE



UNIVERSITY OF



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

THE

CLASSICAL JOURNAL:

FOR

SEPTEMBER AND DECEMBER, 1817.

VOL. XVI.

COL. COLL.
LIBRARY.
N. YORK.

Ω φίλος, εἰ σοφὸς εἶ, λάβε μ' ἐς χέρας· εἰ δέ γε πάμπαν
Νῆϊς ἔφους Μουσέων, ῥίψον ἄ μὴ νοέεις.

EPIG. INCERT.

T

London :

PRINTED BY A. J. VALPY,
TOOKE'S COURT, CHANCERY LANE;

SOLD BY

LONGMAN, HURST, REES, ORME, AND BROWN; RIVING-
TONS; SHERWOOD, NEELY, AND JONES, PATERNOSTER
ROW; BLACK AND CO., YORK-STREET; PARKER,
OXFORD; BARRETT, CAMBRIDGE; MACREDIE
AND CO., EDINBURGH; AND ALL
OTHER BOOKSELLERS.

1817.

CORRECTIONS AND ALTERATIONS.

- NO. XXVII.—p. 55. l. 12. *read* compellant
 ——— 26. *read* Gildâ Albanio, Gildâ Badonico, Saxouico
 veteri ante Badam (utpote qui Pendæ regis Mer-
 ciorum tempore scripsit) anonymo,
 p. 173. l. 12. *read* nullo
 ——— 26. ——— quidem
 p. 181. note 2. *for* infra p. 12. *read* No. LV.
 p. 183. note 4. *for* ut ultimam *read* et ultimam.
- NO. XXX.—p. 209. l. 19. *dele* Porteus
 p. 210. l. 12. Ameilhon
 p. 219. l. 1. δέ
 p. 239. l. 26. &c. κεχαρ—
 p. 256. l. 17. adoucir
 p. 302. l. 5. Pœnorum
 p. 316. l. 5. *read* παθήσας
 p. 317. l. 2. *read* Ἐκχέου
 ——— l. 6. ——— Θεὸς
 p. 322. l. 1. candelabrum
 p. 333. l. 9. *for* that *read* what
 p. 339. l. 5. are,
 p. 340. l. 4. *read* When the fight was at the νῆες ἄκρα,
 the ships &c.
 p. 349. l. 18. The Romans used *venerat antea*, because *antea*
 was the term employed when the time was not modified or
 restricted by an accompanying ablative of time; but they
 said *venerat multo ante*, not *antea*, because the time in this
 expression is modified by the ablative *multo*. So also of *post*
non multo ad exercitum venit; but *postea domum rediit*.
 p. 351. l. 17. *for* fertile *read* futile
 p. 358. l. 12. *for* &c. *read* de
 p. 360. l. 11. ἐννοῦντες
 p. 361. l. 14. *read* furieux d'Amphitrite
 p. 362. l. 3. vers de
 p. 378. l. 27. Géogr—

CONTENTS OF NO. XXXI.

	Page.
The Literary and Scientific Pursuits which are encouraged and enforced in the University of Cambridge, briefly describ- ed and vindicated. By the Rev. L. WAINEWRIGHT ..	1
VINDICIÆ ANTIQUÆ, No. I.	6
Pasigraphy	22
Mots ou omis par H. Etienne, ou inexactement expliqués Par J. B. GAIL. No. VI.	31
De Carminibus Aristophanis Commentarius. Auctore G. B. Pars V.	33
LATIN POEM. De Violatis Regum Sepulchris, iisdemque a Rege Christianissimo Restitutis	43
On the Sapphic and Alcaic Metres, No. IV.	49
A Critical Examination of certain modern opinions respecting the TROAD, and the Descriptions of HOMER; and an in- quiry into the authorities on which they have been founded. By Dr. PARRY, No. II.	57
Observations on the Iambic Metre of Phædrus	74
ΠΕΡΙ ΤΟΥ ΦΟΙΝΙΚΟΣ. By Sir W. DRUMMOND. Part III.	88

De l'Improvisation Poétique chez les Anciens, et particulièrement chez les Grecs et les Romains. Par M. RAOUL ROCHETTE. Sec. Partie	96
E. H. BARKERI Amœnitates Criticæ et Philologicæ. Pars Prima	109
Collatio Codicis Harleiani 5674. Cum Odyssea editionis Ernestinæ 1760. No. VII.	119
Account of Literary Forgeries	123
On the Science of the Egyptians and Chaldeans. By Sir W. DRUMMOND. Part I.	145
Remarks on the Dæmon of Socrates. By THOMAS TAYLOR	160
Stanleii Notæ quædam in Callimachum	164
Cambridge Prize Poem.— <i>Jerusalem</i> . By C. H. TOWNSEND	167
Ode Latina.— <i>Iol Debellata</i> . By G. N. LETTSOM	175
Epigrammata.— <i>ΑΙ ΔΕΤΤΕΡΑΙ ΦΡΟΝΤΙΔΕΣ ΣΟΦΩΤΕΡΑΙ</i> . By G. J. PENNINGTON	178
Senarii Græci, præmio Porsonianò dignati. By G. J. PENNINGTON	ib.
Cambridge Examinations for a University Scholarship	180
ADVERSARIA LITERARIA. No. XIII.—On a Simile in Homer—Use of Arches known among the Ancients—On the death of Jerome Savonarola—Epigram by Ménage—In tunulum Laurentii Toscani—On the authenticity of a verse in Homer—Latin Distich	183
Literary Intelligence	186
Notes to Correspondents	203

THE

CLASSICAL JOURNAL,

NO. XXXI.

FOR SEPTEMBER, 1817.

The Literary and Scientific Pursuits which are encouraged and enforced in the University of Cambridge, briefly described and vindicated. With various Notes.

BY THE REV. LATHAM WAINEWRIGHT, A.M. F. A. S.
Of Emmanuel College, in that University; and Rector of Great Brickhill, Bucks.

Πολλὸν δ' ἰφθίμοισι δεδῶρηται βασιλεῦσι,

Πολλὸν δὲ πτολίεσσι, πολλὸν δ' ἀγαθοῖσιν ἑταίροις.

Theoc. Idyll. 17. v. 110.

MEMBERS of the English Universities, and attached to their institutions and principles, we hail with pleasure every publication, which tends to inform the public of their pursuits and advantages. We cannot better express our opinion of those establishments, than by quoting the words of a writer, whose experience enables him to form a proper judgment :

“Of all national Establishments formed by Piety and dedicated to Wisdom, none can, in the opinion of one who trusts he is not a slave to early prejudices, be compared to the Universities. They exhibit a system, the beneficial effects of which have not been decreased by

NO. XXXI.

Cl. Jl.

VOL. XVI.

A

the gradual relaxation of the original austerities of its foundation: these have been succeeded by a manly liberality, and by the rational cultivation of a more enlarged plan of literary pursuit, inculcated without that severity which hardens, and embraced without that servility which degrades, the human mind. The excellence of these Establishments does not depend on the decision of the question respecting particular modes of instruction in some technical branches of study, in the defence of which a member of the University of Oxford has lately displayed a sagacity and information, worthy the importance of his subject: we may even admit the possibility of further improvements in these seats of learning. That question considers these Establishments only in a literary point of view. But we will suppose a young man, who enters the University without being a candidate for Academical honors, or a claimant of Academical degrees. These are indeed professional advantages; but gratifying as they are, they are surpassed by the moral and civil benefits, which he may reap from a residence at Oxford or Cambridge. He will acquire a habit of associating with the heirs of the first families in the Kingdom; he will learn to respect the venerable Establishments of the Church and State; to love the constitution of his country, and revere the religion of his Fathers. Though he may not himself be fond of application, he will profit by the conversation of the studious and contemplative; his mind will expand to the rays of genius, his taste will be refined, and his judgment matured. He will, by mutual communication, imbibe sentiments of generosity, of every thing that is amiable in disposition, virtuous in principle, and beneficent in practice. By collision with others, he will wear off the asperities of unreflecting presumption, and of local prejudice. He is placed in the path, which leads to all that is good and great in private and in public life. From an English University, he will derive those principles of patriotism, of morality, of religion, and of general conduct, which will enable him to perform, with private credit and public utility, the part of the most honorable and beneficent character in the world,—an English gentleman.”¹

We have, in our former Numbers, inserted an account and a defence of the course of studies pursued at Oxford.² Mr. WAINEWRIGHT, in this publication, conveys a clear and satisfactory description of the literary and scientific pursuits of Cambridge, delivered in elegant and nervous style.

In conformity to the nature of this Journal, we shall confine ourselves to a quotation on the *Classical* studies of that University; containing an answer to those, who represent its institutions as confined to Mathematical objects:

“It has been often asserted, but has never yet been proved, that

¹ Appendix to Dr. VALPY's *Sermons*, 2 Vols. ² No. XII. p. 305.

classical literature, so far from experiencing proper encouragement at Cambridge, is both despised and neglected; and it has been falsely imagined, that he who there aspires to academical distinction, must relinquish the fairy haunts of the Muses, and for ever renounce the society of the poets, the orators, and the sages of Greece and Rome, who had been the companions of his earlier days, and were destined, he had hoped, to contribute to the comfort of his maturer years. We have ample reason, however, to congratulate ourselves upon possessing a system of education, as comprehensive as it is strict and accurate, and which at once excludes a supposition not less erroneous than it is degrading. Whilst the student pursues the sublimest, and ascends with perseverance the craggy precipices of modern science, he neglects not to analyze the beauties and to trace the paths of ancient literature. The true state of the case is, that classical lectures take place in every college throughout that part of each term which requires residence, and uniform attendance is enforced with a proper degree of strictness. Those authors are selected which afford most scope for critical remark, and which at the same time are distinguished by a display of the higher beauties of sentiment and composition. The finest plays of the Greek Tragedians, Plato's Dialogues, the Histories of Herodotus and Thucydides, Aristotle's Poetics, Cicero's philosophical works, and the two treatises of Tacitus, might be enumerated as some of the more usual of the writings of antiquity chosen for this purpose. The advantages on these occasions do not consist merely in calling upon the student to explain the text of the author then in use, but principally in the opportunity afforded of hearing the criticisms of a learned and judicious preceptor, who, in addition to the result of his own researches, can frequently avail himself of manuscript observations not generally accessible. By this means it happens, that scarcely any striking beauties of expression, peculiarities of structure, or niceties of prosody, are suffered to escape the attention of his hearers.

Another instance, in proof of the attention which is required to classical pursuits, is afforded in the examination for the several *scholarships* attached to every college, in which, with a few exceptions, a proficiency in Greek and Latin is considered as more essential than skill in mathematics. The stipends annexed to these scholarships indeed are, generally speaking, but small, but still they are found by experience to be amply sufficient to attract competitors, and to create emulation. Nor must we omit to enumerate amongst these incitements, the excellent institution of *college prizes*. Once or twice in the week, during term, according to the magnitude of the college, a particular day is appointed for the public delivery of two *declamations* by the undergraduates in rotation, to be composed in Latin and English alternately every year. By taking opposite sides of the question fixed upon for discussion, a greater degree of exertion is naturally required, the reasoning faculty is more vigorously excited, and a comparison between the different claimants is more easily effected. Nothing, in truth, can be more gratifying than to listen to

these effusions of youthful genius, destined, perhaps, at some future period, to instruct mankind in wisdom, or to influence their actions by the powers of eloquence.

To this more private mode of encouraging the pursuit of classical literature, I must not neglect to add the *public* prizes and scholarships instituted for the same purpose, and which, by being open to general competition, afford a more trying scene to the efforts of literary ambition, and are on that account frequently more productive of meritorious exertion. Among the foremost of these are the *three medals*, which, in conformity with the will of Sir William Browne, are annually distributed to such undergraduates as prove themselves to be the successful claimants, by the following compositions: 1st, The best Greek ode in imitation of Sappho; 2dly, The best Latin ode in imitation of Horace; 3dly, The best Greek and Latin epigrams of which the *Anthologia* and *Martial* are to be considered as the models. They are afterwards recited by the successful candidates in the Senate House, before the members of the University, and a numerous assembly of visitors. There are also *two medals* annually given by the Chancellor of the University, to the two best proficient in classical literature amongst those who have just obtained their first degree. In the present instance there is an excellent regulation—that no one shall become a candidate for these prizes, unless he was included in the two first classes of honors when he was admitted a graduate. A *third medal* has been added by the present Chancellor, the Duke of Gloucester, which is annually conferred upon the undergraduate who shall be adjudged to be the author of the best English poem, composed either in the lyric or the heroic measure.

The next prizes, which merit the attention of persons unacquainted with the system at Cambridge, are those which are given by the representatives in Parliament of this University, to the authors of the four best *Latin prose dissertations*; and as they are confined to those who have taken their first degree, they contribute to remove the objection which has sometimes been made, that when once a student becomes a graduate, all farther incentive to exertion ceases to exist. The same observation is applicable to the *Seatonian prize*, for the best English poem on a sacred subject, which is restricted to Masters of Arts."

Our author is naturally partial to his own University, and perhaps not perfectly acquainted with every part of the plan of Oxford. Thus he says:

"In the enumeration of advantages possessed by the undergraduates of this University, I ought to have mentioned one, which appears to have little or no existence at Oxford—the liberal use of the noble *libraries*, which add so much to the dignity and reputation of the place. Besides the privilege of access to the library attached to his own college, every student has the power of borrowing ten volumes at one time, from the public or *University library*, by procuring a note from some resident Master of Arts. This fine collection, con-

sisting of nearly one hundred thousand volumes, comprehends not only the accumulated remains of ancient learning, but almost every modern work of any value or celebrity. The Bodleian, on the contrary, is completely inaccessible to the undergraduates at Oxford; and even to those members of the University who possess the liberty of resorting to this splendid library, the value of the privilege is much diminished by the singular regulation which prohibits the removal of every book, without distinction, beyond the walls of the building."

The superiority of the Bodleian to every other library in the kingdom must be granted. If a scrupulous attention to the treasures, which it contains, induces its Curators to forbid the removal of the books, private rooms, with fires and every convenience, are provided for the use of the members of the University, who may send for any books, which they may have occasion to peruse. Undergraduates, who wish to have access to the library, are admitted, by a dispensation obtained at a trifling expense, to the free use of all the books.

The liberal rivalry between the two Universities has produced the most beneficial effects. This extends not only to the two great bodies, but to the colleges of each. Those in which the strictest discipline, and the greatest attention to literary proficiency are observed, are so crowded with applications, that in Oxford it is often necessary to secure rooms several years before admission. In this respect we are compelled to give the preference to the practice of this University. No students are admitted in any college unless they can be accommodated with rooms within its walls; but as soon as they have taken their degrees they are sent into lodgings. At Cambridge no students, properly qualified, are denied admittance on the boards and to the college lectures; but they must sleep in the town, perhaps for some years, until vacancies permit them to be indulged with rooms, which they keep sometimes as long as they please. The difference in point of moral security is striking.

We do not hesitate to assert that the present examinations for degrees in Oxford deserve the attention of the sister University. In Cambridge a student may obtain the highest honors in his degree of B. A. by Mathematics alone, with a very slender share of classical attainments. In Oxford honors are conferred on classical merit without mathematics; and a separate branch of laurel is prepared for those who distinguish themselves in mathematical pursuits. We are sensible of the advantage of mathematical learning; although we do not rest the powers of reasoning, and the niceties of discrimination, exclusively upon it; still less do we follow the celebrated BARROW

Vindiciæ Antiquæ.

assertion that it will make a man honest and good. But we have a right to recommend to the consideration of the heads of Cambridge, whether a proficiency in the classics should not be comprehended in the requisites for an honorable degree. In this examination, and in that for scholarships and fellowships, a *viva voce* construction of the classical authors should be more frequently adopted in Cambridge; and the mode of written exercises in prose and verse, in Greek, Latin, and English, should form a more considerable part of an Oxford examination. But when we consider the gradual and constant improvements in both Universities;¹ when we recollect that the proportion of knowledge, which formerly intitled a young man to the first rank of honors, would at present scarcely secure the second or third; when we behold the influence, which these increasing advances to literary eminence have on our public schools, and on the other Universities of the United Kingdom, and even on those of the Continent, we shall hail with confidence the hope that the rising generation will come into the world with increased qualifications to adorn it by their learning, improve it by their example, and enlighten it by their labors. Friends as we must be to the Church of England, and highly as we think of the knowledge and zeal of its present professors, we cannot but congratulate the members of that Establishment on the means of support, which its principles, its doctrines, and its practice, will derive from the improving systems of its illustrious nurseries, the UNIVERSITIES of OXFORD and CAMBRIDGE.

VINDICIÆ ANTIQUÆ.

No. I.

TOWARDS the close of the seventeenth century, Sir William Temple justly observed, “that whoever converses much among the old books, will be something hard to please among the new.” He assigned as the causes of the decay of learning in his time, “the want or decay of favor in great Kings and Princes to applaud it—the employment of our nobility in arms and conquest—that of our clergy in their devotions, and controversies—of our middle ranks in the pursuits of wealth—and of the lower ranks in toil, to procure the means of subsistence.”—“The vein of ridiculing all that is serious and good, all honor and virtue, as well as learning and piety, is the itch of our age and climate, and has

¹ We have reason to believe that the University Scholarships are on the point of being decided in Oxford by a public examination, as they are in Cambridge. In the Craven Scholarship this has been the case in the present year.

overrun both the court and the stage, enters a house of Lords and Commons as boldly as a Coffee-house, debates of Council as well as private conversation; and I have known in my life more than one or two Ministers of State, that would rather have said a witty thing, than done a wise one; and made a company laugh, rather than the kingdom rejoice: but this is enough to excuse the imperfections of learning in our age." The worthy Baronet, himself an excellent scholar, agrees in opinion with Alphonsus surnamed the wise, King of Arragon; "*That among so many things as are by Men possessed, or pursued in the course of their Lives, all the rest are baubles, besides old wood to burn, old wine to drink, old friends to converse with, and old Books to read.*"

At the time Sir William Temple made these observations, ancient learning was indeed fast declining: but in our times, although we still read the poets and historians of antient Greece, the very *memory* of their philosophy is almost forgotten; and, in some of our Universities, students are taught to ridicule what their masters do not understand, as unintelligible.

The writer of the second introductory essay to the supplement to the Encyclopædia Britannica, in setting forth the excellence of modern philosophy and improvements in science, condemns the system of antient physics as worthless, and says that "Aristotle's definition of motion is highly characteristic of the *vagueness* and *obscurity* of his physical speculations. He calls motion *the act of a being in power, as far as in power*, words to which it is impossible that any distinct idea can ever have been annexed."—"Epicurus," he soon after adds, "defined it to be *change of place*, which is no doubt the simplest and best definition that can be given."—"The properties, or as they are called, the laws of motion, cannot be derived from mere definition; they must be sought for in experience and observation, and are not to be found without a diligent comparison, and scrupulous examination of facts."

The definitions of Aristotle were for many ages admired, as models of express and admirable exactness; and certain it is that no philosopher of any age has taken more pains to render his definitions clear, for he frequently subjoins illustrations to point out distinctly the meaning of the words employed, and their import in combination, and this scrupulous attention to accurate definition pervades the whole writings of Aristotle. That of motion he admits to be very difficult; for change of place, in the common acceptation of the words, he holds to be but one species of motion, which he gives as the last of

six enumerated; and accordingly he takes great pains to define it as exactly as possible: for he observes that without motion no change takes place in the universe.—He characterises the definition of *time* as equally difficult; and although he at first briefly calls it *κινήσεως ἀριθμὸς* the measure of motion, he fully explains in the sequel the fleeting nature of time, and the extreme difficulty of forming a notion of time *present*, as, every instant, the past is for ever gone, and the future hath not yet arrived.

In order to form a correct estimate of the merit of the definition of motion, which to Professor Playfair appears so irrational, we must have recourse to the language in which it is given, and allow to Aristotle that to which every author is entitled, to explain his own meaning.

The definition occurs near the beginning of the third Book, *de Natura*, where, after stating the necessity of acquiring distinct ideas of Motion before we proceed to the study of nature, he says, *Διηρημένου δὲ, καθ' ἕκαστον γένος, τοῦ μὲν ἐντελεχείᾳ, τοῦ δὲ δυνάμει, — ἢ τοῦ δυνάμει ὄντος ἐντελέχεια, ἣ τοιοῦτον, κίνησις ἐστίν.* In this definition it is necessary first to ascertain the true import of the words employed, in their usual acceptation; and then to consider the definition as illustrated by the context.

Ἐντελέχεια is a word said to have been invented by Aristotle, to express more accurately than any single word in the Greek language enabled him to do, the tendency to perfection of the capacity of passive matter, and the energy of active powers.* The word is altered from the *Συντελέχεια* of the antient Pythagoreans, and is more expressive, because the *Ἐν* denotes that the tendency to perfection, or the accomplishment of an end, is actually resident *in* the being of which it is predicated. A block of marble may be converted into a fine statue, and the statue is then the *ἐντελέχεια* of the passive marble, while the labor of the artist is the *ἐντελέχεια* of his active power, an energy directed to the perfection or complete formation of a statue, the type of which already exists in his mind. But here we must observe that the antient philosophers allowed no perfection strictly so called to works of art. The happiest efforts of their artists they held to be incomplete,

* It is true that Lucian in his *Δίκη φωνήντων* introduces the letter Δ as complaining that it has most unwarrantably been deprived of its *ἐντελέχεια*, formerly *ἐντελέχεια*, but there appears no reason to believe that the word was ever so spelt in fact. 'Ακούετε, φωνήεντα δικάσταί, τοῦ μὲν Δ λίγοντας, ἀφείλιτό μου τὴν ἘΝΔΕΛΕΧΕΙΑΝ, ἐντελέχειαν ἀξιούν λίγισθαι παρὰ πάντας τοὺς νόμους.

and these artists themselves inscribing their names on their best productions always used the *imperfect*, denoting that they had been employed in the work, but by no means had been able to bring it to perfection. Thus the makers of musical instruments, however well they may have succeeded, do not call their work complete, but each uses the word "*faciebat*," thus modestly leaving the value of their performances to be determined by others. When therefore we speak of the ἐντελέχεια Δυνάμεος as applied to passive matter—the *perfection of Capacity*—absolute perfection is not understood—but comparative; for no work of art can possibly be altogether perfect. The ἐντελέχεια Δυνάμεος of an intelligent and active being may however reach, in a certain sense, absolute perfection; as the traveller before he sets out on his journey is possessed of the necessary power; but when he has by exertion actually completed his journey and arrived at his destination, the act is perfect, he has effected his purpose. The like may be said of the mariner whose labor, directed by skill, enables him to reach his destined haven; and every human pursuit is carried on by this active energy, or *action* of a being in *power*.

Δύναμις has many significations. It is *active power*, it is *capacity*, it is the power of governing a state, (for Demosthenes informs us that it is impossible for a prince despising truth and the sacred obligations of an oath to acquire permanent established power, δύναμιν βεβαιάν,) and it is used to signify an army—as Lady Percy uses the equivalent word when she says

“ My heart's dear Harry
Cast many a northern look to see his father
Bring up his *POWER*.”

Aristotle, ever careful to define accurately the meaning of the words he employs, and their various acceptations, occupies a whole chapter in explaining the philosophical import of the word δύναμις, under the title of Δύναμις ποσαχῶς λέγεται, so that wherever it may be met with in his works it may be without difficulty understood. First, he says it is explained to be the principle of motion or change—ἀρχὴ κινήσεως, ἢ μεταβολῆς. Sometimes δύναμις implies capacity, whether of acting or suffering, but in its most general acceptation he says it is *the principle of change*: ὥστε ὁ κύριος ὅρος τῆς πρώτης Δυνάμεος ἂν εἴη Ἀρχὴ μεταβολικῇ, ἐν ἄλλῳ ἢ ἄλλο. What the last words of this sentence imply we discover from the concluding part of the definition of motion, ἣ τοιοῦτον, κίνησις ἐστίν, where the τοιοῦτον in the neuter gender, clearly refers to what is made the commencement of the following sentence, but which, we may infer, ought to have been continued in

one, οἷον τοῦ μὲν ἀλλοιοτοῦ ἡ ἀλλοιοτὸν—ἀλλοίωσις. Permutation is the change brought about in a permutable body, in so far (ἢ quatenus) as that change is actually effected, and without regard to other circumstances.

In a following chapter (lib. iii. Physicæ Auscultationes) he again explains and illustrates his definition of motion, and no words can convey a more distinct meaning than these, κινητικὸν μὲν γάρ ἐστι Τῷ ΔΥΝΑΣΘΑΙ, κινεῖν δὲ τῷ ἘΝΕΡΓΕΙΝ. That which *may* move is in *power*—that which *does* move is in *energy*; what then is the fair interpretation of this definition of motion, so freely censured? Is it not that a distinction being necessarily made throughout all nature (καθ' ἑκάστον γένος) between what potentially exists, and that which is in actual existence, the act of a being in power, that is motion? But it will be said, how does this definition apply to inanimate bodies, to the flowing of rivers, the tumultuous motion of the waves of the sea, or the rolling of a rock down a precipitous declivity? Let us bear in mind that Aristotle refers all motion immediately or mediately to mind, because he teaches that no inanimate body can be the cause of motion; and the phænomena of electricity fully establish the fact, that an invisible but active principle pervades all nature, to whose agency we have reason to believe that all motion of animals and things inanimate is to be referred. What this active principle is we know not, for we cannot detain it nor subject it to the scrutiny by which we examine mere matter; but its effects are most evident, and we may say with the poet,—

“Causa latet—Vis est notissima.”

One thing we know, that this most powerful and omnipresent agent is not *mere matter*; and when we admit this, we must also admit that the definition of motion by Aristotle is correct, and that it really is the *act of a being in power*.

He says, that, before we proceed to the study of nature, it is necessary, first, to acquire correct ideas concerning motion, no change in the universe taking place without its agency; for by it material forms come under the cognizance of our senses, and again are resolved into what entirely escapes them. In his book, *de Catagoriis*, he informs us that of motion there are six species, γένεσις, φθορά, αὔξεις, μείωσις, ἀλλοίωσις, and last of all, that which is commonly received as the definition of motion, μεταβολὴ κατὰ τόπον—change of place.

This division of the species of motion proceeds upon the assumption, that from the *materia prima*, to us invisible, material forms come into existence, or rather become perceptible by our senses; and this γένεσις, to which our word *generation* but imperfectly answers, he calls κίνησις

ἀπὸ τοῦ μὴ ὄντος, πρὸς τὸ ὄν. *Motion from a state of non-existence, to actual existence, which we judge of by the evidence of our senses.* The converse of this species of motion is φθορά, when the parts of material forms are again resolved into that from whence they proceeded, the ὑλη πρώτη, and this he calls κίνησις ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄντος, πρὸς τὸ μὴ ὄν, by which words he does not mean that any particle of matter is annihilated; but, as has just been said, entirely escapes the cognizance of our senses. Αὔξησις is perceptible accretion or growth without relative change of place, as plants spring from their seeds; and μείωσις is the converse, the gradual diminution of such substances as tend towards their φθορά. Ἀλλοίωσις is the change of quality effected by motion, the external form remaining unchanged, as well as its local situation, as a piece of wood immersed in certain waters becomes stone, without alteration of form or change of place; and this is called μεταβολὴ κατὰ ποῖον, and the change is said to be effected in the subject, ἢ ἀλλοιοτὸν, that is, considering the change of quality merely, without regard to any other condition or accident, as when, where, &c. The last species of motion is the μεταβολὴ κατὰ τόπον, change of place, which is strictly speaking the effect of motion, but is commonly received as a definition of motion itself. These species are to be regarded as *universals*, for if we come to enumerate *particular* species, we shall find them infinite, which leads the author to conclude that they are as numerous as the species of being; κινήσεως καὶ μεταβολῆς ἐστὶν εἶδη τοσαῦτα, ὅσα τοῦ ὄντος.

The definition of motion given by Aristotle has by some been censured as unintelligible, because his words have been mistranslated, when his philosophical language was no longer commonly understood; and very faulty Latin translations have been quoted as the *ipsissima verba* of the illustrious author. The learned Benedictine, Perionius, observes concerning this very definition, “*motus quidem quid sit, si his verbis definiatur, quibus alii qui ante me hos libros transtulerunt definierunt, sphinge opus erit qui illam ejus definitionem explanet. Quis enim præter admodum paucos, atque eos qui in barbaro sermone educati sunt, intelligere potest, quid sit actus entis in potentia, secundum quod in potentia?*” Here we have the very words attributed to Aristotle by Professor Playfair, words which convey not his meaning, and for which he is in no respect to be held accountable. And here also it may be observed, that as long as the philosophical language of the Stagyræite was understood, so long was he regarded as the first of philosophers, and his commentators, as Simplicius, Philoponus, and Ammonius, are easily intelligible; but when, upon the decay of Greek

literature, Latin translations, and Latin commentaries came into use, the true meaning of the author was lost, and the peripatetic philosophy degenerated into what has been called the "*jargon of the schools*."

An attempt has been made to show that the definition of motion given by Aristotle is just and comprehensive, that his words are nicely chosen, and accurately express his meaning; but whether that attempt hath been successful or otherwise, must be submitted to those who can read the author in his own language; and of those the writer has met with none who complain that his writings are unintelligible.

While Professor Playfair infers the *vagueness* and *obscurity* of the physical speculations of Aristotle, from a very gross mistranslation, he eulogizes Lord Bacon as a great philosopher, who delivered mankind from a slavish subservience to the precepts of antiquity, and introduced the inductive method of reasoning, recourse being constantly had to experience. "The process by induction (says Dr. Reid) is arduous, being an ascent from particular premises to a general conclusion. The Deity governs the world he has made, by general laws; the effects of these laws in particular phænomena are open to our observation, and by observing a train of uniform effects, with due caution, we may at last decypher the law of nature, by which they are regulated." The philosophy of Bacon, by particular experiments, proposes to rise to *general principles*; and he says that nature, if put to the torture, may be brought to confess many of her secrets; but whether he means, that by particular experiments, a knowledge of the laws of nature may be actually obtained as Dr. Reid has said, is not clear. It is however certain that Lord Bacon, a man of great sagacity, and much attached to the study of nature, entered upon the "advancement of science" without knowing what had been done before him; and did not consider that the accidents of matter being infinite, the results of our experiments on matter must also be infinite, leaving us as far from the knowledge of general principles, as when we commenced our pursuit.

For this reason the ancient philosophy was confined to *universals*, and Plato advised his scholars, when they had from first principles descended through the higher genera, which include many subordinate species, down to the lowest rank of species—those which include only *individuals*,—there to stop, because of these there could not possibly be any science. Διὸ μέχρι τῶν εἰδικωτάτων ἀπὸ τῶν γενικωτάτων κατιόντας παρακελεύετο ὁ Πλάτων παύεσθαι—τὰ δὲ ἄπειρά φησιν ἔῃν μὴ δὲ γὰρ ἂν ποτὲ γενέσθαι τούτων ἐπιστήμην. Porpli. Isagoge. c. 2.

Lord Bacon was admonished by Sir Thomas Bodley, when about to publish his *cogitata et visa*, of the inutility of his plan, and the bad consequences that would arise from its adoption. “ In case (says Sir Thomas) we should concur to do as you advise, which is to renounce our common notions, and cancel all our theorems, axioms, rules and tenets, and so to come babes *ad regnum naturæ*, as we are willed in scripture to come *ad regnum calorum*; there is nothing more certain in my understanding than that it would instantly bring us to barbarism, and, after many thousands of years, leave us more unprovided of theoretical furniture than we are at this present. For that were indeed to become *rasa tabula*, when we shall have no impression of any former principles, but be driven to begin the world again, to travel by trials of actions and sense, (which are your proofs by particulars,) what to place *in intellectu* for our general perceptions, it being a maxim of all men’s approving: ‘in intellectu nihil esse, quod non prius fuit in sensu.’ And so in appearance it would befall us, that, till Plato’s year be come about, our insight in learning would be of less reckoning than now it is accounted. As for that which you inculcate of a knowledge more excellent than now is among us, which experience might produce, if we would but essay to extract it out of nature by particular probations, it is no more upon the matter but to incite us unto that, which without instigation, by a natural instinct, men will practise of themselves: for it cannot in reason be otherwise thought, but that there are infinite in all parts of the world (for we may not in this case confine our cogitations within the bounds of Europe,) which embrace the course which you propose, with all the diligence and care that any ability can perform. For every man is born with an appetite of knowledge wherewith he cannot be glutted, but still, as in a dropsie, thirst after more. But yet, why men should hearken to any such persuasions, as wholly to abolish these settled opinions, and general theories to which they have attained, by their own and their ancestors’ former experience, I see nothing yet alledged to induce me to think it.—If now we should accord with you in opinion, First to condemn our present knowledge of doubt and incertitude, (which you confer but by averment) without other force of argument, and then to disclaim all our axioms and maxims, and general assertions that are left by tradition from our elders to us, which (for so it is to be pretended) have passed all probations of the sharpest wits, that ever were *abecedarii*,—by the frequent spelling of particulars to come to the notice of new generals, and so afresh to create new principles of sciences,—the end of all would be, that when we should be dispossessed of the learning

which we have, all our consequent travel will but help us in a circle to conduct us to the place from whence we set forward, and bring us to the happiness to be restored *in integrum*, which will require as many ages as have marched before us, to be perfectly achieved. And this I write with no dislike of encreasing our knowledge with new found devices (which is undoubtedly a practice of high commendation) in regard of the benefit they will yield for the present, that the world hath ever been, and will assuredly continue, very full of such devisers, whose industry that way hath been very obstinate and eminent, and hath produced strange effects above the reach and the hope of men's common capacities; and yet our notions and theorems have always kept in grace both with them, and with the rarest that ever were named among the learned."

In a postscript to this letter, dated Fulham, Feb. 19, 1607, his Lordship is informed that it will be necessary for him to "cast a censor's eye upon the stile and elocution, which, in the framing of some periods, and in divers words and phrases, will hardly go for current, if the copy brought to me be just the same you would publish." This letter is not commonly to be met with in English, and the Latin translation by Gruterus is not accurate; it is however interesting as it shows that Lord Bacon was warned in good time of the consequences to be expected from his system of induction and disregard of ancient learning. That system however was patronized by the court, and James was no doubt proud to have it believed that he had a Chancellor wiser than Aristotle. Grecian philosophy was represented as useless, and ontological researches as visionary, and having no sure foundation in truth. It was in vain suggested by a few, that inductive reasoning was not unknown to the Antients, and that many experiments must have been tried before they reached that comparative perfection of art which leaves all modern efforts so far behind: the doctrines of Lord Bacon were fashionable, and fashion not unfrequently prevails against truth and common sense.

When towards the close of the seventeenth century, Sir Isaac Newton published his *Principia*, it was then said that the laws of motion were discovered on the principles of the Baconian philosophy, and in the opinion of the many, the whole phænomena of the Universe were satisfactorily accounted for by the new discovery. But it is not a little singular, that neither Bacon nor Newton have given any general definition of motion, although the one wrote a tract expressly upon the subject, and the other described to the world the laws by which it is regulated. The terms used by both are very inaccurate,

and the first law of motion, as given by Sir Isaac Newton, is so expressed, that it is evident he did not know the real import of the words he used. It was well observed by Bishop Horsely many years ago, that the words "*status motûs*," state of motion, imply a direct contradiction in terms. "I believe," (says the Bishop) "that some active principle is necessary for the continuance as well as the commencement of motion. I know that many Newtonians will not allow this. I believe they are misled, as I myself have formerly been misled by the expression *a state of motion*. Motion is a change; a continuance of motion is a further change; a further change is a repeated effect; a repeated effect requires a repeating cause. *State* implies the contrary of change; and motion being change, *a state of motion* is a contradiction in terms." The reasoning of the Bishop appears altogether conclusive, and perfectly agrees with the common sense and language of mankind: for we say a fortress is in a state of siege, but not that an army is in a state of march, an arrow in a state of flight, or a ship in a state of voyage. The *vis inertiae* spoken of by Sir Isaac Newton is a contradiction in terms, no less destructive of meaning than the *state of motion*; inertia implying a *privation* of *actual* energy, of which *vis* can never be the attribute, for it implies energy itself, or power exerted. These are not mere verbal criticisms, or slight objections to the philosophy of Sir Isaac Newton, for incorrect definitions are fundamental and essential errors affecting every argument from them derived; and it affords no proof of the accuracy of Sir Isaac's principles, that his mathematical deductions are correct, for we daily see that men can reason justly on assumptions altogether unfounded. It is true that in his later writings he appears to have acquired more correct ideas of motion; but his *laws* of motion which nature never obeys, are assumptions not accurately expressed, and form a kind of attempt to show what would regulate motion, were the order of nature different from what it really is.

Bacon's ideas concerning motion he gives in a separate treatise, *De motûs variis speciebus*; and as his philosophy is confined to matter, or the common phænomena of nature, his definitions of motion are first to be considered, as by it all changes in nature are effected. First, he says, is the "*motus antitypiæ materiæ*," quæ inest in singulis portionibus ejus, per quem plane annihilari non vult. Neque hujus motûs exempla proponi consentaneum est. Inest enim omni corpori." How motion in its most general acceptation should be defined the abhorrence of annihilation, the reader must find out as he best may.

Secondly, he gives as a species of motion, *nexus*, which he explains

to be "*motus ne detur vacuum*," which is merely a subordinate species of the μεταβολή κατὰ τὸ πόνον.

Then, says he, there is the "*motus libertatis*, per quem corpora se liberare nituntur a pressurâ." He gives as instances of this *motus libertatis*, water which reacts upon the swimmer—air upon the bird in its flight—and the pop-guns of children, in which condensed air expels the pellet.

His fourth species is *motus hyles*, which he says is the converse of *motus libertatis*. "Aqua si per compressionem arctetur, recalcitrat, (is not this a *motus libertatis*?) et vult fieri qualis fuit, scilicet latior. At si interveniat frigus intensum et continuatum, mutat se *sua sponte*, et *libenter*, in condensationem glaciei; atque si plane continuetur frigus, nec a teporibus interrumpatur, (ut fit in speluncis, et cavernis paulo profundioribus,) vertitur in crystallum, nec unquam restituitur."

Then comes the *motus continuationis*, by which he appears to mean what we call the attraction of *cohesion*; and the sixth species he calls *motus ad lucrum* sive *motus indigentiae*, and the examples show that by this term he means *elective attraction*. His seventh and eighth species he calls *motus congregationis majoris*, and *motus congregationis minoris*. By the first he says that he means that power by which heavy bodies fall to the earth, and the light ascend, ad ambitum cœli. By the *motus congregationis minoris*, he says, that cream ascends to the surface of milk, and the dregs of wine subside to the bottom.

Motus magneticus is the ninth species.

Motus fugæ the tenth, by which animal excretions, antipathies are accounted for; and it may be sufficient merely to enumerate the other nine species.

Motus assimilationis.

Motus excitationis.

Motus impressionis.

Motus configurationis aut sitûs.

Motus pertransitionis.

Motus regius vel politicus.

Motus rotationis spontaneus.

Motus trepidationis, and finally

Motus exhorrentiæ *Motûs.*

Thus Lord Bacon enumerates nineteen species, without once informing us what his definition of motion is; and he might easily have increased the species to hundreds and thousands, for the accidents of motion are infinite. Let any unprejudiced man, who understands the

Greek and Latin languages, compare the definitions of motion, and the illustrations given by Aristotle, with the tract written upon the same subject by Lord Bacon, and say who of the two is to be accused of "vagueness and obscurity in his physical speculations." Let him try to express in other words the meaning of Bacon, and see whether he can make out any distinct definition universally applicable. From the extracts given above, the reader will see that he assumes the compressibility and elasticity of water, as its proper qualities, and enumerates certain effects of motion as its species. He will also see, upon an examination of his works called philosophical, no trace of his acquaintance with the antient philosophy beyond a smattering of mythology, which he dignifies with the title of "Wisdom of the Antients;" and there is reason to believe that he was not well acquainted with Greek literature, for with the exception of one trite line from Homer, introduced as complimentary to himself, there is nothing of the language in his works.

He knew that certain logical works of Aristotle are styled *organum*, and he gave the title of *novum organum* to his treatise, in which he proposes his improvement in the manner of carrying on philosophical investigation; a work so much admired by Dr. Reid, that he said "he was apt to measure a man's understanding by his estimation of the works of Bacon." He, with many other modern writers, seems to think that men did not reason justly, nor try experiments, till Bacon pointed out the way; and by many it is believed that he condemned the antient philosophy, because, after making himself fully acquainted with it, he had discovered its defects. It is, however, certain, that the arts were in a high state of perfection in the days of Aristotle, a perfection to which frequently repeated experiments must have been necessary; and the writings of the peripatetic philosophers bear witness how accurately they reasoned. It has, however, been the lot of those illustrious men to be censured and despised when they are no longer understood; for while their writings were distinctly comprehended, their fame remained in meridian lustre, and was only eclipsed when men had arrived at what Plato calls that "grievous ignorance which imagines itself the perfection of wisdom." Ἀμαθία μάλα χαλεπή, δοκοῦσα εἶναι μεγίστη φρόνησις. We shall in vain inquire for any scholar who, understanding the works of the antient philosophers, does not admire them, while on the contrary those who ridicule their philosophy afford the most convincing proofs that they make themselves merry for want of that information which would not fail to ensure their respect. When we contemplate the numerous writings

on metaphysics and philosophy that have succeeded one another in rapid succession since we have lost sight of our antient guides—the continual attempts to arrive at fixed principles which as continually fail, we cannot rationally indulge in the hope that we are in the right path that leads to the acquirement of true science. It was the great study of the antient philosophers to distinguish truth from falsehood, but no part of the writings of Aristotle is now more ridiculed than his *Analytics*, which teach the rules of just reasoning by the syllogism, of which he is said to have been the first inventor. Of this work, so closely expressed that the illustrations of commentators are for the most part necessary to explain the true meaning, Dr. Reid undertook to write an analysis; a very hopeless task, in which it is not to be wondered at that he utterly failed. It is worthy of notice, that this writer, although a man of great probity, very freely censures the writings of the Stagyræ, and then admits that he had neither read them fully over, nor understands them. “His writings,” says the Doctor, “carry too evident marks of that philosophical pride, vanity, and envy, which have often sullied the character of the learned. He determines boldly things above all human knowledge; and enters upon the most difficult questions, as his pupil entered upon a battle, with full assurance of success. He delivers his decisions oracularly and without any fear of mistake. Rather than confess his ignorance, he hides it under hard words and ambiguous expressions, of which his commentators may make what they please. There is even reason to suspect that he wrote often with affected obscurity, either that the air of mystery might procure great veneration, or that his books might be understood only by the adepts who had been initiated in his philosophy. The faults we have mentioned are such as might be expected in a man who had the daring ambition to be transmitted to all future ages, as the prince of philosophers, as one who had carried every branch of human knowledge to its utmost limit, and who was not very scrupulous about the means he took to obtain his end.” This censure can neither be regarded as candid, liberal, nor fair, in a man who thus expresses himself in another part of his work. “In attempting to give some account of the *analytics* and topics of Aristotle, ingenuousness requires me to confess, that though I have often purposed to read the whole with care, and to understand what is intelligible, yet my courage and patience always failed before I had done. Why should I throw away so much time and painful attention upon a thing of so little real use?”

“If I had lived in those ages, when the knowledge of Aristotle’s

“Organon” entitled a man to the highest rank in philosophy, ambition might have led me to bestow upon it some years of painful study, and less I conceive would not be sufficient. Such reflections as these always got the better of my resolution, when the first ardour began to cool. All I can say is, that I have read some parts of the different books with care, some slightly, and some, perhaps, not at all. I have glanced over the whole often, and when any thing engaged my attention, have dipped into it till my appetite was satisfied. Of all reading it is the most dry and painful, employing an infinite labour of demonstration about things of the most abstract nature, delivered in a laconic style, and often I think with affected obscurity; and all to prove general propositions, which when applied to particular instances, appear self-evident.” These extracts from Dr. Reid’s *Analysis* of the Logic of Aristotle, are very interesting, as they show the gross injustice practised in our times towards the illustrious dead of former ages. The late Lord Kaimes, it appears, applied to Dr. Reid for an account of the Logic of Aristotle, to form an appendix to one of his *Sketches of the History of Man*; and how the Doctor executed his task—and how far he was qualified to undertake it, the preceding passages show. His Lordship, however, was anxious to establish the superiority of modern learning and modern philosophy; and upon the supposition that he was not very desirous of a favourable report of the peripatetic logic, he applied for information, not to those who had studied and really understood the works of Aristotle, for then he might have properly consulted Harris or Monboddo, but to Dr. Reid, who admits that he believes it would cost him the study of years to comprehend the “organon,” as far as it is intelligible. Now this “organon” forms but the introduction to the Philosophy of Aristotle, and gives the rules by which in his philosophical writings he distinguishes between truth and falsehood. The import of the words used, being first accurately explained, these rules are delivered in the most concise manner, so that amplification is necessary to those who enter upon the study to render them intelligible: but it is not true that he uses *hard words and ambiguous expressions, of which his interpreters can make what they please*; for when those who have studied the “organon” proceed to the study of his philosophical works, they find in every page practical illustrations of the rules of the organon, which prove that the illustrations of the Alexandrian commentators on that work are in every respect just and well founded.

That the “organon” was so concisely expressed as to require illustration, Aristotle himself informs his pupil Alexander, and therefore we cannot wonder that Dr. Reid should complain of the study as *dry*; but when he adds that a great labour of demonstration is used to prove general propositions, which when applied to particular instances, appear self-evident, he admits the intelligibility of the work, and unintentionally pays the highest compliment to the inventor of the syllogism, whose object it was to render what at first appears doubtful, by a short and conclusive train of reasoning *self-evident*. In no age of the world did the knowledge of Aristotle’s organon intitle a man to the highest rank in philosophy; that knowledge merely qualified him to enter upon the study of philosophy, when he might with the greatest pleasure prosecute the studies, that to the author of the Analysis appeared so dry and painful. Doubtless the study of Homer and Demosthenes must prove dry and painful to those who are but imperfectly acquainted with the Greek language; for the accuracy and beauty of the composition only become apparent to those who by patient study have surmounted the difficulties of the language, and made themselves acquainted with the style of the authors. But no Greek scholar who will take the trouble of studying the “organon” with the assistance of Porphyry, Ammonius, and Philoponus, will complain of it as unintelligible; and a farther acquaintance with the writings of the author, will convince the most sceptical reader that his terms are express, and well chosen. If it be true that in order to understand the writings of Euclid and Archimedes there is need of illustrations and diagrams to enable the learner to discover the sense—if in the study of the ancient poets, rhetoricians, and historians, much attention be necessary in order to discover their excellence and beauty—how shall any man, confessing that he has never studied attentively the works of Aristotle, pretend to decide upon their merits, or give an analysis of that which he confesses he does not understand?

In common with his countrymen who have written on the subject of modern metaphysics, Dr. Reid thinks but lightly of definitions; and says that Aristotle’s have exposed him to much censure and ridicule; “yet,” he adds, “it must be allowed that in things which need definition, and admit of it, his definitions are commonly judicious and accurate; and had he attempted to define such things only, his enemies had wanted great matter of triumph. I believe it may likewise be said in his favor, that until Locke’s essay was *written*, there

was nothing of importance delivered by philosophers, with regard to definition, beyond what Aristotle has said upon the subject." From this passage it would appear that Dr. Reid believed Aristotle to have attempted express definitions of the *infinite*, the ἀπείρα; but this he did not do, because he tells us that however far we extend our inquiries in subjects infinite, there must ever be something ulterior, and of such subjects we can have no perfect science. "Aristotle," says Dr. Reid, "considers definition as a speech declaring what a thing is. Every thing essential to the thing defined, and nothing more, must be contained in the definition. Now the essence of a thing consists of these two parts: first, what is common to it with other things of the same kind; and secondly, what distinguishes it from other things of the same kind." According to this definition of the essence of a thing, we know that essence, when we know its *genus* and *species*; and this Dr. Reid says "he takes to be the substance of Aristotle's system, and probably the system of the Pythagorean school before Aristotle, concerning definition." Let us suppose a trial made of the Doctor's definition of the essence of a thing—let Linnæus furnish the generic and specific characters of a plant, and see whether from these we arrive at a knowledge of what the essence of that plant is; or even gain a competent knowledge of its properties. Let us bear in mind that in this case the genus and species of a tree, for example, merely refer to its external form and character. Before we can give an accurate definition of the sensible qualities of this tree, we have to put many questions. Is it tall or short, young or old, hard or soft, gross or slender, crooked or straight, with many branches or few? &c. But an answer to each and all of these questions, will not inform us of the real essence of the tree; nor did the antients ever assert that the mind of man in his present state can comprehend it. Indeed Dr. Reid says, but two pages after he has given this definition of the *essence of a thing*, "what the logicians have said about the definition of a thing, if it have any meaning, is above my comprehension. All the rules of definition agree to the definition of a word: and if they mean by the definition of a thing, the giving an adequate conception of the nature and essence of any thing that exists, this is impossible, and is the vain boast of man unconscious of the weakness of human understanding." It is scarcely necessary to say that such a boast was never made.

What then are the rising generation to believe? Are they to reject the philosophy and learning of the antients as worthless and unmeaning, upon the testimony of those who avow that they have never read

their writings, and regard all those as visionaries, who study and admire the more, the more fully they comprehend? Is it fair, is it consistent with the common principles of justice, that gentlemen habited in gowns, and presiding over the education of youth in our universities, should dare to represent that as unintelligible which they have never studied, and to represent that as *exploded*, of which they know not the merits? The subject, however, deserves the close attention of all those who are interested in the investigation of truth, for in that consists the only real pleasure to be enjoyed in this life; and it is proposed to resume the consideration of the comparative merits of ancient and modern learning hereafter.

PASIGRAPHY.

THE sensations and reflections formed in our own minds, we communicate by means of oral sounds; to represent these to the eye, and enable others to imitate them, is the object of writing.

Can means be devised to abridge the middle step in this process? Is it possible to invent signs, characterising not sounds, but the very ideas themselves of which sounds are the representations?

If such an art can be perfected, it will possess important advantages over alphabetical writing. By its aid, all the sons of men, whatever may be their maternal tongue, may communicate among one another: their thoughts will be conveyed more vividly, more faithfully, and more precisely; but above all, the judgment of each individual will be formed with less liability to error, than when guided by information derived through the present medium.

That the Chinese mode of writing proceeds on this plan of representing ideas, not words, is well known. On the arrival of Lord Macartney's embassy at Pulo Condore, the chief of that island received his visitors in a room, which was observed to be covered with columns of Chinese writing; but the Chinese interpreter on board did not understand one word of the spoken language of the islanders. On their writing it down in Chinese characters, it became instantly intelligible to him, "and the fact was clearly ascertained," as Sir George Staunton expresses it, "that these characters have an equal

advantage with Arabic numerals, of which the figures convey the same meaning wherever known, whereas the letters of other languages denote not things, but elementary sounds, which form words, or more complicated sounds, conveying different ideas in different languages, though the form of their alphabet be the same." In almost all the countries bordering on the Chinese seas, we are indeed told that this written character is understood, though not their oral language.

Some benefit, no doubt, might arise from a careful examination of the Chinese process, and on some occasions, perhaps, in borrowing from it; but we have already sufficient information to conclude that the whole system cannot be copied with advantage by another nation. It is, we find, the study of a life to become well acquainted with all their written characters. Though the tongue itself is monosyllabic, and possesses but about fifteen hundred distinct sounds, yet when written, it requires at least sixty thousand characters; some say, eighty thousand. On the formation, changes and allusions of these, thousands of volumes have been written: not above half a dozen characters are formed of a single line, but most of them of many; a few, of so many as seventy different strokes. Some of these characters of which we happen to be informed, seem whimsical; others, perfectly arbitrary; and hardly any deserving of imitation. For instance, the verb "to run," is composed of two characters, that of "wrapping," and that of "feet." When this compound character was adopted, its inventors probably went barefoot, and when running, to prevent accidents to the feet, were in the habit of folding them in hide, felt, cloth, or some other rude succedaneum for a shoe. "Night" is typified by three characters; 1. that of darkness; 2. the action of covering; 3. man. But surely this definition is not sufficiently accurate. All nights are not dark: night covers not man alone, but all nature: a man may be in the dark by day, as well as night.—This definition depicts the night, no more than it does blind-man's-buff: one more simple, and more true, might have been formed, it would seem, by subjoining to the generical sign for time, their type for the sun, with a negation.—Again; to express "marriage," a character is employed, compounded of two, representing "wine," and "a seal;" because the wine presented on that occasion by the bridegroom to the bride, is considered as the seal of their union. Many seem perfectly capricious. "To laugh," is expressed by two characters signifying a bamboo and heaven. "A prison," by three, signifying a dog, a word, and again, a dog. In order to comprehend the meaning of a compound Chinese character, that of its several component parts

must of course be first sought; but after this knowledge is acquired, the sense is sometimes so hid in metaphor, and in allusions to particular customs, or ways of thinking, that the meaning may yet remain in obscurity.¹ In the study of Chinese writings, the judgment must be guided by attention to the manners, customs, laws, and opinions of the Chinese, and to the events and local circumstances of their country.² By the most competent judge of the subject now living, we are indeed expressly told that in the Chinese writing, "the practice is no less inconvenient and perplexing, than the theory is beautiful and ingenious."³ To deserve the appellation of universal, a language should steer clear of all allusion to customs, local or temporary, and each term should present to all men a meaning definite, and of itself intelligible.

To revert to our European notions of Pasigraphy, among the first, if not the very first writer to whom the utility of such an art has occurred, is the great Chancellor Bacon. In his "Instrument of Discourse," he says, "it is possible to invent such signs for the communication of our thoughts, that people of different languages may by this means understand each other; and that each may read immediately in his own language, a book which shall be written in another.—As money may be struck of other materials as well as of gold and silver, it is possible likewise to discover other signs of things as well as letters and words." The advantages likely to result from such a discovery, the means of attaining it, and the difficulties impeding its execution, also struck the inquiring and sagacious mind of Descartes. In his printed correspondence he speaks of the necessary primitives to be employed in such a language, and on their signs. If by meditating on the subject of our thoughts, the order in which they arise, and produce others, could be distinguished, the due succession of these could be arranged with the same simplicity as the notation of numbers. In a single day, a man may acquire all the terms of numeration in a foreign tongue, however remote in sound from his own. If the same order were discoverable in the arrangement of all other subjects of thinking, it is evident that the terms in which they are expressed might be learned with equal facility. The philosophy which may thus decompound, simplify, and filiate our ideas, and which is indispensable for the formation of this universal language, he is disposed to

¹ Barrow's Travels in China, ch. vi. p. 254.

² Staunton's Chinese Embassy, III. 5.

³ Laws of China, translated by Sir G. T. Staunton, Pref. p. 14.

think may be found out, and that therefore the art itself is attainable. Were the human race to receive this benefit, any peasant, he thinks, might then be enabled to form a more correct judgment on truth in general, than at present is in the power of a philosopher:—*cujus beneficio, rusticus quispiam de rerum veritate posset melius judicare quam jam philosophus aliquis.*¹

The earliest pasigraphical attempt, of which any memory is preserved, was made by a Spanish Jesuit residing at Rome in 1653. For its preservation we are indebted to Kaspar Schott, professor of mathematics at Wurtzburg in 1666. Though the latter was of the same religious order, and was at Rome in the same year, he professes his ignorance of the author's name. By his scheme, it is proposed to reduce all words to genera and species, and to express them by numerals: Roman numerals denoting the genus, Arabic, the species. The next in order of time, was the production of a physician at Mentz, John Joachim Becher, and published at Frankfort in 1661. The plan in each of these is adapted to the Latin language: Becher indeed merely proposes the substitution of a numeral for each Latin word in the Dictionary, prefixing the same numeral to the word of similar meaning in every other language. In order to distinguish the inflections of nouns, verbs, and adverbs, to each number expressing the word, he subjoins another number separated from the first by a colon, and expressing the particular inflection in which it is meant to be employed. For the nominative singular, for instance, he subjoins, 1. for the genitive, 2. for the dative, 3. &c. The indicative mood, present tense, singular number, first person, of the verb active, is distinguished by 13, &c. In all, 173 numbers. A Latin dictionary is to be provided, in which all words, as they stand in alphabetical order, are to be distinguished by a number: another list is to be prepared for every other language, into which the same number that is prefixed to the word of similar import in the Latin dictionary, is to be prefixed to each word. In writing, the number alone is to be employed; but if a noun, verb, or adverb, with the number expressing the case, number, gender, degree of comparison, mood, tense, &c.; and the meaning of each word is then to be sought in the list appropriate to each language.

One of the advantages attributed by the author to his scheme is, that by an agreement between two correspondents, to change arbitrarily the signification of each of the numerals, a cypher difficult to

¹ Cartesius: *Epistolæ omnes*, p. 1. Ep. 3. ad Mersennum, p. 315—317.

discover may be established. Perhaps the whole scheme may rather be viewed as a cypher, than as a successful step in Pasigraphy. It is, indeed, not *πᾶσι γράφειν*, but properly, intelligible to those only who read Latin, and built entirely on the syntax of that language. For example, 159 stands for the supine in *um*; and 160, for the supine in *u*. The structure of sentences cannot in two languages be exactly alike, any more than the number and meaning of words; in particular, not of the particles, on which the whole construction and sense of each sentence depends. Becher's scheme must therefore be viewed merely as a substitution of numbers for Latin words, and holds out no advantage sufficient to compensate the enormous trouble, of a double search at least, for every single word, written and read. Such as it is, however, the scheme was attempted, in 1805, to be revived, for want of better employment, by some persons composing what they were pleased to style, a Celtic academy, at Paris.—For Latin, as might be expected, these Celtic gentlemen recommend the adoption of French, the preparation of dictionaries in their own tongue, and in all others, with the numbers to each word in French, and to the corresponding word in foreign tongues, precisely on the plan of Becher.

In the year of Becher's publication, George Delgarme, an Englishman, entered on the same career. His work was printed in London under the title of “The art of Signs, or a Universal Character and Philosophical Language, by means of which, men of the most different idioms may in the space of two weeks learn to communicate, whether by word of mouth or writing all their thoughts, as clearly as in their mother tongue.” This work, which we have never seen, also adopts numerical figures, as signs of words. One of the twenty-two folio volumes of which Athanasius Kircher, a German Jesuit, was the author, and published at Rome in 1663, is entitled, “*Polygraphia, seu Artificium linguarum, quocum omnibus totius mundi populis poterit quisquam correspondere.*” Still another Jesuit, Père Besnier, published at Paris in 1674, a work entitled, “*La Réunion des Langues, ou l'art de les apprendre toutes, par une seule.*” Joachim Frisichius, a Professor in the Gymnasium at Riga, appears to have been employed about the same time in a similar attempt, of which a specimen was printed at Thorn, in 1681. But he who appears to have been most devoted to the pursuit and discovery of this art, was the famous Leibnitz. From the year 1666, when in the twentieth year of his age, he printed his *Dissertatio de arte combinatoriâ*, till the year 1714, two years ante-

cedent to his death, there remains evidence of his retaining the persuasion of the practicability and the utility of this art. During a space of nearly half a century, he recurs to this favorite subject in his correspondence, regretting latterly his want of time and of assistance to complete this grand design. An analysis of the subjects of our ideas must, according to his opinion, precede the formation of a universal language; an intellectual alphabet, "*Alphabetum cogitationum humanarum*," must be constructed, and then symbols devised, representing objects of sight by some of their prominent parts; things not objects of sight, by some visible objects having relation to them: the inflections of words and particles, to be noted by arbitrary connecting signs. By these means may be obtained a character, which may effect for speech in general, what is now effected in algebra and arithmetic, by signs and cyphers. Such a work he thought might be accomplished by a few literary men in the compass of five years. By this invention, the mental faculties might be as much aided, as the eye is by the use of the microscope and telescope. All the other powers of man, he says, may be perverted and misapplied, but the exercise of a sound and right judgment can be directed only to useful purposes. A third part of our lives might be saved by such an art, as we employ that portion, at least, in the acquisition of languages.

In October, 1814, five lectures on the pasigraphic art, were delivered at Vienna by J. M. Schmid, a Professor in the Bavarian University of Dillingen. Of three of these, the substance is contained in a small pamphlet printed in March 1815, at Dillingen, under the title of "*Magazin für allgemeine sprache*;" which the professor announces his design of continuing periodically, dedicating it principally to the reception of papers on this art. When the second number of this magazine appeared, we are not apprised; but a third was printed in March of last year, in which a fourth number is promised in August, and not less than three or more than five in each succeeding year. Of these the first and third numbers, are all we have yet had the good fortune to receive.

In his preface, the author commences with observing, that we all employ our thoughts on the same objects; the laws governing our modes of thinking are substantially and unalterably the same; our sensations alike; no essential difference in the organs of speech; and yet, within two days' journey, it often happens that no one man comprehends another's speech. Though the observers, the mode of observation, and the objects observed, are alike, yet the appellations

bestowed on those objects, and on the sensations to which they give rise, are subject to infinite variation.¹

On how many occasions, and in how many ways, is this variance productive of inconvenience! We wish to make ourselves understood by, and to understand, every person with whom we come in contact: we wish to make ourselves acquainted with the literary productions of other nations; but the difference of speech stands in the way. The more extended our travels, the more earnest our desire to improve our minds, the greater is the number of foreign idioms which we must master. But the acquisition of languages requires so much time as to encroach essentially on that necessary for more important purposes. Experience also proves that this knowledge is as easily lost as acquired; and that constant practice alone can make it possible for a man so to express himself in speech and writing in two or three languages, as that the foreigner may not be detected. How few are the writers who have composed classically in two languages? and who has accomplished this, in three? How natural therefore is the wish that some one speech, or at least one writing may be adopted, in which the educated persons of all nations may communicate with each other? The conviction of the high importance, and of the practicability of such a language, has become more general; and though it must be admitted that all the preceding attempts to devise such a mode of communicating our ideas have not been successful, its impossibility is not by any means to be inferred. A periodical publication which shall receive and contain all that can enable the friends of literature to form a just judgment on the subject, would itself be of some value, though the attempt should utterly fail. Those attempts that have been made, are dispersed in books, some of very rare occurrence, and all of them never yet have been brought together under view.

From holy writ we learn² that there was once but one language: what has been, may be again. On the inventors of the new language, if success attends the attempt, it will be incumbent to comprize in it all the advantages and excellencies now to be found in each existing language. Suppose ourselves in the time before the invention of musical notation, had any one then announced his discovery of a cypher for tones, of such a nature as that the voice, or an instrument, should be directed in it in any tune or measure, would not this have

¹ Vater computes that about five hundred languages are now spoken. Adelung. *Mithridat.* III. 2 Abtheil. Berl. 1813.

² Gen. xi. 1.

been disbelieved? So many various sounds; instruments so different; and these all to be directed in exact harmony, by a written cypher! Impossible! And yet such a cypher we have; sufficiently perfect, independent of all language, and in its nature pasigraphic. Music, composed by an Italian, can be played in concert by Germans, French, Spaniards, Englishmen, on different instruments, without one understanding the language of another. This is also the case with regard to arithmetical cyphers, algebraical and mathematical signs, those employed in pharmacy, in astronomy. Objects of a nature widely remote from each other are at present, therefore, represented by signs, independent of speech. Why may we not come to an agreement as to all others? That wall of separation which unfortunately, by the diversity of tongues, keeps asunder civilized nations, would then be removed.

Should pasigraphy ever be brought to perfection, it must be by taking an enlarged view of the subjects of human thought, and showing how each idea is connected with, and opposed to another: it must be elevated above the accidents of a grammar or dictionary, freed from the iron sceptre of custom, and must be framed so as to leave the mind in perfect liberty in its conceptions and communication. It is clear that all the objects of thought cannot be distinguished by peculiar signs: a classification must be attempted. We may begin by dividing them into the two great heads of animate and inanimate. The first division may include matter; the second, plants; the third, beasts; the fourth, man; the fifth, spirit. On whatever objects the human intellect may expatiate, or fancy employ itself, to one of these five they may be reduced. Suppose C. to represent existence in general, C¹. may be applied to matter: C². to plants: C³. to beasts: C⁴. to man: C⁵. to spirit. In his fourth lecture, which, if published, we have not yet received, the author promises further to develope his ideas on pasigraphical relation. If it be fair to judge of what we have not seen by what we have, we confess we do not anticipate much progress in the art. Confining our attention to that portion of it which is addressed in the first instance, and exclusively, to the eye, and considering the great number of signs which will be indispensable, and the expedience of distinguishing their relations in the most simple, and at the same time obvious manner, we apprehend the attempt should be made in symbol writing, to effect as much as possible by position. Supposing all objects typified by invariable signs, their relations to each other may be denoted by placing the cyphers above or below, in parallel lines, in a manner resembling that practised in musical notation.

The art of instructing the deaf and dumb by gestures, which is at present both at Paris and in London so successfully practised, is also in its nature pasigraphical. The ingenious improvers of this art could undoubtedly furnish valuable hints, and particularly as to their mode of classifying and describing objects not within the reach of external sense. In the attempts to effect this by pasigraphical means, the progress of the incipient art may perhaps be checked by expecting from it more than any art can effect. Of the five divisions into which Professor Schmid would reduce the objects of human ideas, C⁵. it is apprehended, will prove a blank. What does man know of immaterial beings? By what organs can he investigate their nature? By what terms but negations can he express them? All our ideas are derived mediately or immediately from the senses: to employ our reasoning faculties on matters beyond their reach, in search of knowledge which is not given us by means of organs not adapted to the purpose; and attempting it by the generalization or abstraction, as it is termed, of ideas derived from another source, can only lead to error and to evil. On what we thoroughly comprehend, we may, nay at last we must, come to an agreement: but where we only impose on ourselves and others, by pretending to any knowledge, the history of the world will evince that this leads but to endless and bitter controversy. The most valuable purpose to which pasigraphy itself can be applied, is to aid our mental calculations in distinguishing knowledge from ignorance, as well as from error. The difficulty that will attend the just and perfect representation to the eye of all moral objects in general by symbols, will be found, we fear, considerable; if to be accomplished at all, we apprehend Leibnitz's proposal the most likely to succeed, of uniting in concert in the pursuit, the talents of many ingenious men of different countries. The end in view is for the general good of mankind: were a previous correspondence to be carried on, and if any attempt to simplify and find the source of our moral judgments seemed likely to have satisfactory results, were a personal meeting to take place, from free conversation and debate perhaps some valuable ideas might be elicited. The learned world owes great obligation, in the mean time, to Professor Schmid, for laying the ground-work of such a plan; and we heartily wish that those who have given attention to this subject, and who we know are not few in number, would avail themselves of this opportunity to bring the whole, as it were, to a focus. In a subsequent number we hope to lay before our readers a more full account of the Professor's labors, in particular of his critique on Bishop Wilkins's plan, which we believe he has published in his second number.

MOTS OU OMIS PAR H. ETIENNE,

Ou inexactement expliqués.

Par J. B. GAIL, Lecteur Royal et Conservateur des Manuscrits
Grecs et Latins de la Bibliothèque du Roi.

No. VI. [Continued from No. XXVIII. p. 285.]

52. ἀρόητος, act. et pass. *qui intelligi non potest, et qui non intelligit.* H. Et. qui explique ce mot, tom. 2. p. 1073. e. ajoute, νοητὸν ὀπποῖτ τῷ νοῦν ἔχοντι; mais νοητὸν est, je crois, fautif; lisez, ἀνοητόν.

53. δικαίωσις. Sens remarquable de ce mot ignoré d'H. Etienne et de Denys d'Halicarnasse lui-même.

Je dis dans ce journal, (No. I. Vol. XII. p. 216.) que H. Et. se montre à tout moment étranger à l'analogie. J'aurais dû ajouter, que les principes de l'analogie et des désinences étoient quelquefois ignorés même d'écrivains grecs estimés; que Denys d'Halicarnasse, par exemple, sembloit ne pas se douter du véritable sens de δικαίωσις. Ce critique célèbre, qui s'est appliqué à instruire les Romains sur leurs antiquités, connoissoit-il à fond les origines et les principes des désinences de sa propre langue, lorsqu'il met au rang des expressions poétiques le δικαίωσις de Thucydide, 3, 82? N'est-il pas évident que δικαίωσις est à noter non comme mot poétique, mais comme le mot propre, et tellement le mot propre, qu'aucun autre n'eût aussi bien rendu l'idée de Thucydide?

Et en effet, que signifie δίκη? la justice proprement dite, cette justice émanée de la divinité (Soph. *Æd. T.* v. 904.) et que l'on foule aux pieds dans ces tempêtes révolutionnaires graphiquement décrites par Thucydide. Alors, plus de justice, soit divine, soit humaine, δίκη. Alors les méchans en font une à leur gré, qui est l'ἰσχύος ou βίας δικαίωσις (Thuc.); alors ils fabriquent un code de justice qui certes n'émane plus du ciel. Cette justice qui n'est plus δίκη, comment l'appeler? δικαίωσις.

On dira d'un juge intègre, δικάζει; d'un juge inique, δικαιοῦ. Ce juge inique ne juge pas, il s'efforce de rendre juste (force de la désinence ὦν) ce qui ne l'est pas: il donne à sa décision les couleurs de la justice: son prononcé est, non pas δίκη, mais δικαίωσις. Le juge inique en vient-il à braver ouvertement toutes les loix, alors il ne se donne pas même la peine de donner à ses décisions les couleurs de la justice; et c'est ce degré de perversité que signale Thucydide 8, 66. 2. (dans ce livre si remarquable par la profondeur des idées, et que cependant de tristes critiques refusent à Thucydide comme plein de négligences), οὔτε δικαίωσις ἐγίγνετο, mots que j'ai rendus imparfaitement par *nec ulla legum minabatur*.

54. διανοία, opposé à γνώμη, signifiera, *idée vague*; mais quand il n'aura pas de correspondant il signifiera, *idée en général, pensée quelconque*. Dans la phrase suivante, "Ὁμηρος λέξει καὶ διανοίᾳ πάντας

πὲρ βέβληκε, (Aristote, de arte poet. ch. 34.) ainsi commentée par Quintilien, *hic omnes sine dubio et in omni genere eloquentiæ super- vit*, le contexte détermine facilement le sens de *διανοία*.

55. *Διάχυσις ὑγρότης ὀμμάτων*.—Examen d'une locution de Plutarque, citée mais non expliquée par H. Et.—opinion d'un antiquaire sur cette locution.—Mes conjectures sur *διάχυσις*.

1. *διάχυσις*, au propre, signifiera *diffusio* : ainsi, πολυτ. οἶνων δια- ὕσεις, *vini pretiosi diffusiones*. Dans le sens métaphorique, Plutarque dit (de Alexandri fort. p. 373, ed. Wech.) τῶν ὀμμάτων τὴν διάχυσιν αἱ ὑγρότητα μιμῆσθαι θέλοντες ; et (in Erot. sub finem), τὸ γὰρ ἄρμακον ᾧ τὴν κόμην αἱ γυναικες ἀναλειφόμεναι ποιοῦσι χρυσοειδῆ αἱ πύργον, ἔχει λίπασμα σ. ἢ χαννωτικὸν σαρκός· ὥστε οἷον διάχυσιν ἢ διόγκωσιν ἐμποιοῦν.

A la suite de ces deux exemples, H. Et. note ces trois mots de signification voisine *χαννοῦν*, *διαχύειν*, *διογκοῦν* et *χαννωτικὸν σαρκός*, et *διάχυσιν τινὰ ἢ διόγκωσιν σαρκός ἐμποιοῦν*, et dit, *qui enim aliquid xius fungosiusque reddit, idem et diffundit, dilatatque, ut tumore uodam sese diffundat latius et aperiat* : puis il ajoute, *animo etiam tribuitur διάχυσις, quia nimirum ex auditu, visu, cogitatione jucundū sese diffundit et aperit : ut contra rebus molestis mæstisque contrahi- citur*. D'après ces notions et gloses qui établissent le sens de *διά- χυσις*, soit au propre, soit au figuré, arrivons à l'important passage précité de Plutarque. En parlant de Lysippe, qui réussit à donner aux yeux d'Alexandre une fidèle expression, Plutarque (l. 1.) emploie cette locution, τῶν ὀμμάτων τὴν διάχυσιν καὶ ὑγρότητα, “laquelle” selon M. Visconti “désigne la splendeur des yeux. Lorsqu'ils sont brillants et mobiles, ils paroissent, pour ainsi dire, nager dans un crystal : quoiqu'un artiste puisse difficilement représenter cette qualité du personnage qu'il copie, dans un portrait en peinture, et plus difficilement encore en sculpture, il paroît que Lysippe, par la forme des contours, par le creux de quelques parties, et probablement par le moyen de quelque matière brillante incrustée dans ses bronzes, avoit su obtenir un effet presque équivalent.” Ainsi, selon M. Visconti, τὴν διάχυσιν καὶ ὑγρ. τῶν ὀμμάτων désigneroit la splendeur des yeux, obtenue, probablement, dit-il, par le moyen de quelque matière brillante incrustée dans ses bronzes. Si M. Visconti eût prononcé, je me soumettrois ; mais il hésite : j'oserai donc émettre ma conjecture, et dire que τὴν διάχυσιν désigne, non pas l'éclat des yeux, mais la facilité des regards à se porter de droite et de gauche (force de *διὰ*), et plus litt. l'action (de l'œil) de se répandre çà et là : un autre diroit, d'après le physiologiste Magendie, la diffusion des nerfs de l'iris ; mais je ne donne l'explication de *διάχυσις* qu'à titre de conjecture, et avec l'intention de revenir sur ce mot.

DE CARMINIBUS ARISTOPHANIS

COMMENTARIUS.

AUCTORE G. B.

Pars v.—[Vid. No. XXX. p. 292.]

NON leve profuit, nisi fallor, inventum meum de Epodis, ad Lysistratam emendandam; neque minus valebit maculas abstergere non paucas, quæ diu Vespis Comici adhæserunt, non cuivis homini eluendæ. In ea fabula mihi videbar tres cantus Antistrophicosprehendisse. At Hotibius eos præoccupavit. Restat tamen inter Epodos et Systemata, quod ingenium satis exerceat, et laureolam, mihi præreptam, aliquatenus compenset.

273 et sqq. στρ. α'. } Ita Hermann. de Metr. p. 326.=502.

280 et sqq. ἀντιστρ. α'. } qui melius rem gessit quam Bentleius.
Sed neuter vidit sic legendum esse carminis initium.

	στρ.	ἀντιστρ.
τί ποτ' οὐ πρὸς θύρων		τάχα δ' ἂν διὰ τὸν
φαίνεθ' ἡμῖν		χθ=πινδὺν ἄνθρωπ-
ὁ γέρων οὐδ' ὑπάκουε;		ον, ὃς ἡμᾶς διεδύετ'
μῶν ἀπολώλεκεν		ἐξ ἀπατῶν λέγων,
τὰς ἐμβάδας ἥ προσέκοψεν κ. τ. λ.		ὡς ἦν φιλαθήναιος καὶ κ. τ. λ.

Inter quæ φαίνετο et ὑπάκουε sunt Ionica. Mox καὶ inseritur, postquam ἐξ ἀπατῶν fit ἐξαπατῶν, constructionis causa.

291 et sqq. στρ. β'. } Ita Hermann. de Metr. p. 351.=503.
302 et sqq. ἀντιστρ. β'.

318 et sqq.

φίλοι, πάλαι μὲν τήκομαι διὰ τῆς ὀπῆς
ὁμῶν ὑπακούων· ἀλλὰ γὰρ οὐχ οἷός τ' ἰδεῖν

τηροῦμαι δ' ὑπὸ τῶνδε
 βούλομαι γε πόλυσ μεθ'
 ὑμῶν ἐπὶ τοὺς καδίσκους
 ἐλθῶν τι κακὸν ποιῆσαι
 ἀλλ' ὦ Ζεὺς ἐλασιβρόντας καπνὸν ἐξαίφνης με ποιήσον,
 ἢ τὸν Προξενίδην ἢ τὸν Σέλλου τὸν ψευδαμάμαξυν.

Hos versus ordine alio disposuerunt Porsonus ad Hec. 1169. et Bentleius: alio Reisigius Conject. p. 199. et Hermann. de Metr. p. 746. Sed omnes falluntur. Bene tamen Porsonus expulit εἰμὶ post οἶός τ' et recepit ἰδεῖν pro ἄδειν e Dawesio p. 263. Bene quoque Bentl. τηροῦμαι δ': et sic Rav. Jure etiam Porsonus delevit τί ποιήσω: quæ fuit e var. lect. ἐλθεῖν τι κακὸν ποιήσω, quam varietatem indicabat καὶ post τῶνδε in Ald. at καὶ fuit olim γάρ. V. 4. Ms. B. πάλαι πάνυ. Porson. ut vulgo γε πάλιν. Ipse πόλυσ. Vid. Blomfield. ad S. C. Th. 6. Ἐτεοκλέης ἂν εἰς πολὺς κατὰ πτόλιν ἔγμοιθ'. V. 7. Vulgo Ἄλλ' ὦ Ζεῦ μέγα βρόντα κάμε ποιήσον καπνὸν ἐξαίφνης ἢ Προξενιάδην ἢ τὸν Σέλλου τοῦτον τὸν ψευδαμάμαξυν. Inde erui distichon Heptametrum. Vid. ad Ranas in *Classical Journ.* No. xxv. p. 38. et 41. Pro tetrametris habuit Bentl. et Interpolator, qui addidit τοῦτον. Recte tamen Bentl. post Fl. Chr. legit Προξενίδην e Schol. citante Av. 1126. Προξενίδης ὁ κομπάσευς. Quod ad ἐλασιβρόντας, cf. Eq. 626. ἐλασίβροντ' ἀναρρήγνυς ἔπη, e Pindarico Ἐλασίβροντε παῖ Ῥέας, et κεραυνοβρόντας in Pac. 375. necnon Homericum νεφεληγερέτα Ζεὺς.

334 et sqq. Hæc quatuor systemata sic legenda sunt.

τίς γάρ ἐσθ' ὁ ταυτὰ σ' εἶργων κάποκλείων τὰς θύρας;	}	σύστημα α'.
λέξον' πρὸς εὖνους γὰρ φράσεις		
τοῦ δ' ἔφεξιν, ὦν μάταιος, ταῦτα δρᾶν σε βούλεται	}	β'.
τίνα τε πρόφασιν ἔχων; λέγεις;		
τοῦτ' ἐτόλμησ' ὁ μισαρός χανεῖν ὁ κημο-βδελυ-κλέων,	}	γ'.
ὁ τὸ πρὶν νέων ἐν ἤθεσι;		
οὐ γὰρ ἂν ποθ' οὗτος ἀνὴρ τοῦτ' ἐτόλμησεν λέγειν,	}	δ'.
εἰ μὴ ξυνωμότης τις ἦν.		

In β'. optime Rav. ἔφεξιν — δρᾶν, pro ἐφέξιν et δρῶν: etenim copulantur ἔφεξιν et πρόφασιν: quod ut melius fieri posset, huc retuli ex γ'. voces ibi abundantes: legitur enim ὅτι λέγεις τι περὶ τῶν νεῶν ἀληθές: unde erui τε λέγεις ὁ τὸ πρὶν ἐν ἤθεσι, et eruta suis locis inserui. Quod ad sensum, redde ὁ τὸ πρὶν νέων ἐν ἤθεσι per Latinum illud *qui vixit ex ephebis egressus est*: quod ad verba, adi Photium Ἡθεσι, τοῖς συνήθεσι τόποις, ταῖς ἐξ ἔθους διατριβαῖς, et confer Euripideum λίσχαι γυναικῶν. Mox vice ὦ μάταιε dedi ὦν μάταιος. Certe Chorus eo nomine minime compellasset Philocleona, sed filium ejus postea dictum μισαρόν. In γ'. legitur Δημολογο-κλέων. At juvenis ille fuit Βδελυκλέων: et collatis v. 99. et 100. patet quo jure dici possit κημο-βδελυ-κλέων: quo nomine et ipse

pater dici poterat ad fabulæ finem ; ubi moribus tandem mutatis exclamat βάλλε κημούς in v. 1339.

365, 6 σύστημα, α'. } In α'. vulgo Ἔως γὰρ ᾧ μελίτιον. Brunck.
369, 370 ————— β'. } μελίττιον : qui toto cœlo errat. lege
373, 4 ————— γ'. } Ἔως γάρ· οὐ μελλήτέον. Cf. Phœn.
1395. οὐ μελλήτέον, et Eccl. 876. κοῦ μελλήτέον : ubi Ald. μελητέον.
Hinc corrige Strattidem apud Etymol. v. Φώζειν, legendo Ἄλλ' εἰ
μελλήσεις ἀνδρείως Φώζειν, ὥσπερ μύστακα, σαυτὸν vice μέλλεις —
σεαυτόν : at μύστακα est dactylus apud Eubulum in Τίτῃ, teste
Antiatticista p. 108. μελλήσεις quoque est legitimum futurum. In
β'. Vulgo Ἄλλ' ἔπαγε δὴ τὴν σὴν γνάθον. Rav. omittit δὴ et σὴν.
Recte, ut opinor. Ipse lego τὴν γ' ὄνου γνάθον. Hesych. Ὀνου
γνάθος. Εὐπολις παίζει εἰς πολυφαγίαν.

375, 6, 7, 8. Sic lege Τὴν καρδίαν· καὶ τὸν δρόμον ψυχῆς περὶ Δρα-
μεῖν, ἵν' εἰδῇ μὴ πατεῖν τ' Ἀθηναίων (sic enim lego pro τὰ ταῖν θεᾶν)
deleto ψηφίσματα : quod præcepit et Hotibius.

405 et sqq.

νῦν ἐκεῖνο, νῦν ἐκεῖνο
τοῦξύθυμον, ᾧ κολαζό-
μεσθα, τὸ κέντρον
ἐντέτατ' ὀξύ.

410 et sqq.

καὶ κελεύετ' αὐτὸν ἥκειν,
ὥς ἐπ' ἄνδρα μισόδημον
ὄντα ἀπολογούμενον,
ὃς λόγον τόνδ' εἰσφέρει,
ὥς μὴ δικάζ-
ειν χρὴ δίκας.

Hic vulgo deest τό.

Pro μισόπολιν dedi quod est in
473.

418, 9. στρ.

428, 9. ἀντιστρ. } Ita Bentr. qui legit θεοισεχθρία et sic Brunck.
in Supplemento.

462 et sqq.

ἄρα δῆτ' οὐκ αὐτὰ δῆλα
τοῖς πένησιν, ἡ τυραννὶς
ὥς λάθρα γ' ἔλαβ'
ὑποπιούσά με.

} Vulgo ἐλάνθαν' ὑποιοῦσα. Rav. ἔλαμβαν' :
Ipse dedi ἔλαβ' ὑποπιούσα : cf. Antig.
531. ὥς ἔχιδν' ὑφειμένη, Ἀθήουσά μ'
ἐξέπινες.

468 et sqq.

οὔτε τιν' ἔχων πρόφασιν
οὔτε λόγον εὐτράπελον
αὐτὸς ἄρχ-
ων μόνος.

473 et sqq.

σοὶ λόγους, ᾧ μισόδημε,
καὶ μοναρχίας ἔραστα,
καὶ ξυνῶν Βρασίδα καὶ φορῶν
κράσπεδα
στεμμάτων τὴν θ' ὑπήνην ἀκουρον
τρέφων.

486, 7.

οὐδέποτ' ἄν· οὐχ ἔως σοῦ τι λοπὸν ἦ,
ὅστις ἡμῶν ἐπὶ τυραννίδ' ἐστάλης.

} Vulgo τί μου.

526 et sqq. στρ.

} Hermann. de Metr. p. 315. = 427. et Por-

631 et sqq. ἀντιστρ. } son. apud Gaisford. ad Hephæst. p. 292.

729 et sqq. στρ.
 πιθοῦ, πιθοῦ λόγοισι, μήδ' ἄφρων
 γένῃ,
 μήδ' ἀτενὴς ἄγαν ἀτεράμων τ' ἀνὴρ·
 εἴθ' ὥφελέν μοι κηδεμῶν ἢ ξυγγενὴς
 εἶναι τις, ὅστις τοιαῦτ' ἐνουθέτει·
 σοὶ δὲ νῦν τις θεῶν 5
 παρῶν ἐμφανὴς
 ξυλλαμβάνει τοῦ πράγματος,
 καὶ δῆλος εὖ ποιῶν σε·
 τὸ δ' εὖ παρὸν δέχου.

743 et sqq. ἀντιστρ.
 νενουθέτηκεν αὐτὸν, εἰς τὰ πράγμαθ'
 οἷ-
 ος τότε ἐμαίνεται· ἔγνωκε γὰρ ἀρτί-
 νους,
 λογιζέται τ' ἐκεῖνα πάνθ' ἀμαρτίας,
 οἷς, σοῦ κελεύοντος, οὐκ ἐπείθετο.
 νῦν δ' ἴσως τοῖσι σοῖς 5
 λόγοις πείθεται,
 καὶ σώφρον', ὅψε γοῦν, μεθιστ-
 ἀς ἐς τὸ λοιπὸν τὸν τρόπ-
 ον, πιθόμενός τε σοί.

Hæc antistrophica detexit Hotibius p. 105. et post eum Reisig. p. 124. ducti procul dubio a Rav. qui veras lectiones, aut vero proximas, conservavit. Etenim in strophæ omittit δὴ et τῶν, in v. 4 et 5. Mox teste Reisigio Ms. apud Seidlerum habet ἔστιν in v. 8. unde erui potest ποιῶν σε τὸ δ' εὖ, vice ποιῶν σὺ δὲ vel δ' αὖ. Et sane memor Horatiani præcepti *Præsens carpe diem* hic reposui τὸ δ' εὖ παρὸν δέχου : quæ locutio similis est Sophocleæ in *Œd. C.* 1694. τὸ φέρον ἐκ θεοῦ καλῶς χρὴ φέρειν : ubi licet φέρον tueatur Suidas bis, bene tamen Sallier apud Heathium restituit παρόν : cui favet v. 1540. τοῦκ θεοῦ παρόν : neque a Comici mente distat proverbiale dictum, τὸ παρὸν εὖ ποιεῖν, apud Platonem in *Gorgia* p. 340. E. et Diogen. Laert. in *Pittaci* vitâ ; neque τὸ παρὸν θεραπεύειν apud Sophoclem in *Phil.* 149. neque Χρὴ τὸ παρὸν πράγμ' εὖ καλῶς τ' Εἰς δύναμιν τίθεσθαι apud Cratinum, teste Photio : neque illud Hesychio, Τὸ παρὸν εὖ τίθεσθαι. Seager quoque in *Classical Journal*, No. iv. voluit παρόν, alio licet sensu. In antistrophæ v. 2. Ms. B. οἷς τ' ἐπεμαίνεται : i. e. τότε ἐμαίνεται : ut patet ex Rav. οἷα τότε ἐπεμαίνεται : at edd. vett. οἷς ποτ' ἐπεμαίνεται : Mox ἀρτίως ὅτι : at Rav. et Ms. B. omittunt ὅτι. Pro ἀρτίως reposui ἀρτίνους : quod exponit Euripides in *Orest.* 248. ἄρτι σωφρονῶν : ubi Porson. e Diogene Laertio sumsit ἀρτίως φρονῶν. In Hesych. est Ἀρτίπνουν, ὀρθόπνουν, male. Debuit esse vel Ἀρτίπνουν vel Ἀρτίπουν. Certe Ἀρτίφρων bis usurpat Euripides. V. 4. Ita Rav. pro παρακελεύοντος : unde erui potest παρακαλοῦντος. V. 7. Vulgo φρονεῖ μέντοι. Rav. σωφρονεῖ μέντοι. Ipse vero propter *Orest.* 99. et *El.* 1111. ὅψε γε φρονεῖς εὖ : *Bacch.* 1343. Ὅψ' ἐμάθει—*Œd. C.* 1264. ὅψε γοῦν ἐκμανθάνω, *Agam.* 1427. ὅψε γοῦν τὸ σωφρονεῖν, et *Vesp.* 217. Νῆ τὸν Δί' ὅψε γοῦν non hæsitavi reponere voces efficaces, loco ineptæ particulæ μέντοι.

869 et sqq. στρ.
 ᾧ Φοῖβ' Ἀπόλλων κλυθί, κά-
 πὶ τὰγαθῇ τύχῃ
 τὸδε τὸ πράγμ', ὃ γε μηχανᾷτ'

885 et sqq. ἀντιστρ.
 ξυνευχόμεθα, καπάδομέν
 σε γ' ἐσχάrais νέαις
 ἔνεκα τῶν προλελεγμένων.

ἐμπρόσθεν οὗτος τῶν θυρῶν,
ἅπασιν ἡμῖν ἀρμόσει-
ας παυσαμένοισι τῶν πλάνων,
Ἰήϊε παιάν.

εὔνοι γὰρ ἐσμὲν, ἐξότου
5 τὸν δῆμον ἡσθόμεσθά σου
φιλοῦντος, ὥς τῶν νῦν γ' ἀνὴρ
γενναιοτάτ' οὐδεῖς.

Hæc quoque carmina antistrophica esse vidit Hotibius, et post eum Reisig. p. 39. Sed neuter rem acu tetigit. In strophæ v. 1. dedi κλύθι pro πύθι. Etenim abundat nomen; at verbum modo non efflagitur. V. 3. Vulgo absunt δὲ et τό: mox γε huc retuli ex antithetico post ἔνεκα. V. 5. Vulgo ἀρμόσαι ὥς. Inde erui ἀρμόσειας. In antistrophæ v. 2. Vulgo σοὶ γ' ἐν νέαισιν ἀρχαῖς. At ἐσχάrais νέαις bene convenit cum τελετὴν καινὴν in 876. V. 6. Vulgo ὥς οὐδεῖς ἀνὴρ τῶν νῦν γε σοῦ νεωτέρων. At Schol. τῶν συνεωτέρων et γενναιοτέρων pro var. lect. quam in textu habet Rav. Meam conjecturam aliquatenus tuetur Pac. 773. Γενναιοτάτου τῶν ποιητῶν adjuncto Ran. 1254. Ἀνδρὶ τῷ πολὺ πλείστα δὴ καὶ κάλλιστα μέλη ποιήσαντι τῶν ἔτι νυνί.

1009 et sqq.

ἀλλ' ἴτε χαίροντες ὅποι βούλεσθ'.
ὕμῃς δὲ τέως ᾧ μυριάδες
νῦν τὸ μέλλον τ' εὖ λέγεσθαι,
μὴ πέσης φαύλως χάμαζε.
τοῦτο γὰρ σκαιῶν θεατῶν
ἐστὶ πάσχειν, κοῦ πρὸς ὕμῶν.

V. 2. Ita Rav. pro δέ γε ταχέως.
V. 3. Delevi ἀναρίθμητοι gl.
pro μυριάδες: et εὐλαβεῖσθε pro
εὖ λέγεσθαι.

1060 et sqq. στρ.

1091 et sqq. ἀντιστρ. } Ita in Schol. distinguuntur.

1226, 7.

1232, 3, 4, 5.

1238, 9.

1245, 6, 7, 8.

Inter hæc sunt Scolia, quæ leviter mutata, vel non, in suos usus convertit Comicus: cuius tamen lepores nemo satis intellexit—neque id mirum—locus etenim est valde depravatus—sic emendandus. Sed prius argumentum contexere libet, quam verba singulatim tractare. Patrem suum Philocleonem, jam moribus et studiis mutatis, edocet Bdelucleon, quomodo se gerere debeat inter epulandum apud homines beatiores: et mox fingit, cæna jam peracta, adesse convivis cantandi tempus: etenim ut ipse loquitur

Αὐλητρίς ἐνεφύσησεν· οἱ δὲ συμπόται
εἰσὶν, Θέωρος, Αἰσχίνης, Φανὸς, Κλέων,
Ἀναξαγόρας τε πρὸς κεφαλῇς Ἀκιστόρος.
τούτοις ξυνὼν, τὰ σκόλι' ὅπως δέξει καλῶς.

ΦΙΛ. ἀλλ' ἐστ', ὅσ' ἄδης γ', ἴκρι' ὥς τάδε δέξεται εὖ;

ΒΔΕ. τάχ' εἴσομαι καὶ δὴ πάρειμ' ἐγὼ Κλέων·
ἄδω δὲ πρῶτος Ἀρμοδίων· δέξει δὲ σύ·
“οὐδεὶς πώποτ' ἀνὴρ Ἀθηναῖος” —

ΦΙΛ. οὐχ οὕτω γε πανοῦργος ἦν κλέπτῃς.

1219

1225

BΔΕ. ταυτὶ σὺ κράξεις ; παραπολεῖς· βοῶμενος
φήσει γὰρ ἐξολεῖν σε καὶ διαφθερεῖν
καὶ τῆσδε τῆς γῆς ἐξελαῖν·

ΦΙΛ. ἐγὼ δέ γε, 1230

ἐάν γ' ἀπειλῇ νῆ Δί', ἕτερον ἄσομαι·
“ὁ νοῦς ἦν τις ὁ μαινόμενος μέγα τι κράτος
ἀντρέψαι τάχα τὰν πόλιν· ἃ δ' ἔχεται ῥοπαῖς.”

BΔΕ. τί δ', ὅταν Θεωρος, πρὸς ποδῶν κατακείμενος,—

ΦΙΛ. ἄδη, Κλέωνος λαβόμενος τῆς ἱζυος, 1235

“Ἀδμήτου λόγον ᾧ ταῖρε μαθῶν, τοὺς ἀγαθοὺς φίλει·
τῶν φαύλων δ' ἀπέχου· γνοῦς ὅτι φαύλων ὀλίγα χάρις.”

BΔΕ. Φανῶ τί δὲ δέξει σκόλιον ;

ΦΙΛ. ὠδικοὺς λέγω·

“οὐκ ἔστιν ἄλωπεκίξειν Φανὸν,
οὐδ' ἀμφοτέρως γίγνεσθαι φίλον.”

BΔΕ. μετὰ τοῦτον Αἰσχίνης ὁ Σέλλου δέξεται—

ΦΙΛ. “χρήματα κὰν βία”

Κλειταγόρας λάκων.

BΔΕ. ἀνὴρ δ' ἄτοφος κάμουσος Ἀκέστωρ ἄσεται—

ΦΙΛ. “μετὰ Θετταλῶν δὴ πολλὰ μοι” 1245

διεκόμπασας σύ γ' ἐκ καπνοῦ.

Quo melius horum verborum lusus aperiatur, opus est annotatione prolixiori : quam tamen nemo refugiet, qui Comicum intellegere volet. Inter cœnam quinque convivæ interfuerunt. Quorum omnes, suo quisque ordine, Scolion canere finguntur : quod Philocleon a proprio ad ridiculum sensum detorquet. Hinc versum de Harmodio ad Cleona deflectit, qui aliquoties bona publica surripuit. Et similia dici possunt de ceteris, ut mox exponam. Nunc mutationes verborum percurrere libet.

1221. Vulgo ξένος τις ἕτερος. At Comicus in tali loco non hominem quemlibet peregrinum, sed specialiter aliquem proprio nomine insignire debuit ; neque aliud fecit. Cur reposuerim Ἀναξαγόρας, vide ad 1230.

1223. Vulgo Ἀληθὲς ὡς οὐδεὶς γε διακρίων δὲ δέξεται. Inde erui Ἀλλ' ἐσθ', ὅσ' ἄδης γ', ἱκρί ὡς τὰδε δέξεται· εὐ. Dixerat **BΔΕ.** τὰ σκόλια δέξει καλῶς. At **ΦΙΛ.** sciscitatur utrum sedes, i. e. mensæ vel theatro appositæ, sint bene recepturæ quæcunque ipse canat. Amphibolia est in ἱκρία τὰδε et τὰδε, ὅσα γ'. Quæ sint ἱκρία, patet e Suid. “ἱκρία, ὁρθὰ ξύλα ἢ σανιδώματα τῆς νηὸς καὶ τὰ τῶν θεάτρων — πρὶν γενέσθαι τὸ θέατρον, ξύλα ἐδέσμευον καὶ οὕτως ἐθεώρουν. Ἀριστοφ. Θεσμοφ. [402.] Ὅστι' εὐθύς εἰσίνοντες ἀπὸ τῶν ἱκρίων. Ubi ἱκρία primam producit.

1224. Vulgo ἐγὼ εἴσομαι. Sed ἐγὼ displicet repetitum. Formula nota est τάχ' εἴσομαι. Cf. Ach. 331. Iph. A. 970. Τάχ' εἴσεται. Phœn. 260. ibid. Pro γάρ εἰμ' dedi πάρειμ' : vid. ad Æschyl. Suppl. 257. et Herc. F. 1237.

1226. Vulgo ἐγένετ' Ἀθηναῖος. Bentr. ἔγεντ' : Elmsl. ad Ach. 978. in Auct. γένετ' ἔν γ'. Mox vulgo deest ἦν.

1228. Vulgo δράσεις. Reposui κράσεις. Cf. Plut. 369. Σὲ μὲν οἶδ' ὃ κρώσεις. Mox inepte παραπολεῖ.

1232. Vulgo ἄνθρωφ'. At Scholia exhibent ex Alcæo ὤνησεν οὗτος, corrupte pro ἄνους ἦν τις ο : et ex ἄνους fit ἄνους i. e. ἄνθρωπος. Scripsit quidem Lyricus de tyranno, fortasse Myrtilo ; qui

ἄνους ἦν τις ὁ μαινόμενος μέγα τι κράτος, } Schol. τάχα τρέψεις
'Αντρέφαι ταχὺ τὰν πόλιν' ἃ δ' ἔχεται ῥοπαῖς. } et ἀνατρέψεις ταχέως.

At verba aliquantisper mutavit Comicus in Ὁ νοῦς ἦν τις ὁ μαινόμενος, Anaxagoram ridendi causa ; qui dictus fuit per jocum ὁ νοῦς, teste Plutarcho in Pericle p. 154. B. Nunc tandem intellige cur reposuerim Ἀναξαγόρας τε pro ξένος τις ἕτερος in v. 1221. Mox τὸ μέγα in μέγα τι mutatur. Sæpe τι sic reperitur post ὀλίγον, σμικρὸν, βραχὺ necnon πολὺ, et μέγα.

1235. Pro δεξιᾶς reposui ἵξους scil. penis. Cf. Vesp. 1382. τοῦδ' λαβομένη τοῦ σχοινίου Ach. 1121. καὶ σὺ, παῖ, τοῦδ' ἀντέχου ibid. 1215. τοῦ πέους ἄμφω μέσου προσλάβεσθ' ὦ. Eupolis apud Etymol. v. Κόντιλος sic legendus — εἶμι· παῖς, σὺ δὲ Τούτου γ' ὀπισθεν καταλαβοῦ τοῦ κοντίλου : ubi puer aliquis cæcum hominem membro illo, potius quam manu, ducebat.

1237. Bene sit Scholiastæ conservanti alterum versum τῶν δειλῶν δ' ἀπέχου γνοῦς ὅτι δειλῶν ὀλίγα χάρις. At cum ῥίψασπις fuit Cleon, parum decuit Theorum illi ignaviam exprobrare. At potuit idem amicus, cum vidit Cleonis amorem erga homines parum validos, illi in memoriam revocare vetus dictum ὅτι τῶν φαύλων ὀλίγη χάρις, quod et in animo habuit Plato in Symposio p. 320. G. Τοῖς μὲν ἀγαθοῖς ἐκάστου τοῦ σώματος καὶ ὑγιεῖνοις καλὸν χαρίζεσθαι καὶ δεῖ — τοῖς δὲ κακοῖς καὶ νοσώδεσιν αἰσχρόν τέ ἐστίν καὶ δεῖ ἀχαριστεῖν. Ad idem Scolion respexit Apollonid. Epigr. v. ἐξ ὀλίγων ὀλίγη χάρις. Igitur reposui φαύλων pro δειλῶν. Unde patet Theorum esse φαῦλον.

1238. Vulgo τούτῳ τί λέξεις σκόλιον ἀδικὸς ἐγώ. MSS. ὠδικῶς, cum Fl. Chr. At Bergler. ὠδικός : et sic Antiatticista—exponens per εὖ ἄδων. Rescripsi igitur λέγω pro ἐγώ. Paulo ante dedi δέξει vice λέξεις. At σ adhæsit e σκόλιον. Dein φανῶ pro τούτῳ. Causa etenim non fuit cur Phanus suum Scolion omitteret. Illud fuit haustum, ut e Scholiis conjici potest, e Praxilleis : quæ Poetria scripsit fortasse καλὸν in eo versu, ubi restitui φανὸν ob φίλον omissum : neque objici debet metrum ; etenim φίλος primam producit apud Lyricos.

1242, 3, 4. In his inest duplex sensus. Cleitagora, cujus Scolion est illud Χρήματα κὰν βία, fuit ποιητρία Λακωνικὴ teste Schol. ad Lys. 1239. Hinc quivis Λάκων dici potest Κλειταγόρας. At

Sellus fuit olim pauper; postea dives factus est, teste Schol. ad Av. 824., fortasse pæderastis nimis facilem se præbendo, muneribus Laconum corruptus: ideoque δέξεται σκόλιον Κλειταγόρας λακῶν “*χρήματα κὰν βία*” utpote συμπότης—vel utpote Λάκων δέξεται χρήματα καὶ Κλειταγόρας [Spartanos] ἐν βία. Cum Scolio Cleitagoræ conferri debet Aristodemi Spartani dictum; cujus meminit Alcæus in Fragm. xxviii., sic legendo,

᾽Ως γὰρ δὴ τοῦ ᾽Αριστόδαμός φησιν οὐκ ἀπάλαμνον·

“*Σπάργτα χρήματ’ ἀνὴρ· πενιχρὸς δ’ οὐδὲν ὦν, λέγεται ἔσλος.*”

Ubi οὐδὲν ὦν usurpatur ut μηδὲν ὦν in Ajac. 766. οὐδὲν ὦν ibid. 1218. Tro. 1010. et οὐδὲν ἦν ibid. 1162. et οὐδὲν ἦτ’ ἄρα in Iph. T. 569. Spartani mentem expressit Horatius: *virtus, nisi cum re, vilior alga est*, et Cleitagoræ χρήματα κὰν βία per suum rem facias, rem: *Si possis, recte; si non, quocunque modo, rem.*

1244. E vulgatis Ἀνὴρ σόφος μουσικὸς κατ’ ἄσεται, quæ nulla ratione conciliari possunt cum verbis Schol. ὥσπερ μὴ σόφος οὐ δὲ μουσικὸς, erui Ἀνὴρ δ’ ἄσοφος κάμουσος Ἀκέστωρ ἄσεται. Ubi jocus est in δ’ ἄσοφος et δὲ σόφος necnon καὶ ἄμουσος et καὶ Μυσός. Etenim Acestor fuit malus poeta et Mysius, teste Schol. ad Av. 31. Οὗτός ἐστιν Ἀκέστωρ, τραγωδίας ποιητής, ἐκαλεῖτο δὲ Σάκας. — Θεόπομπος δὲ καὶ τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ Σάκαν προσηγόρευσε Τισαμένω—ὁ δὲ αὐτὸς καὶ Μυσὸν ἐκάλεσεν· εἰς δὲ τὴν ποίησιν αὐτοῦ κεχλευάκασι, Καλλιᾶς μὲν ἐν Πεδήταις, καὶ Σάκον οἱ χόροι μισοῦσι Κρατίνος ἐν Κλεοβοῦλοις Ἀκέστορα γὰρ ὅμως εἰκὸς λαβεῖν πληγὰς ἐὰν μὴ συστρέψῃ τὰ πράγματα. Ibi Comicorum fragmenta sic lege—καὶ Σάκαν Ὅν οἱ χόροι μισοῦσι, et—Ἀκεστοραμυσον εἰκὸς ἦν λαβεῖν Πληγὰς, ἐὰν μὴ συστρέψῃ τὰ δράματα. Ubi luditur in Ἀκέστορα Μυσὸν et Ἀκέστορ ἄμουσον. Idem lusus restitui debet Theopompo; cujus fragmentum servat Schol. ad Vesp. 1216. Ἀκέστερος—ὃς ἐκαλεῖτο Σάκος. Θεόπομπος Τισαμένω· οὐ κοινῶς ξένον ἀλλὰ Μυσόν· τὸν δὲ Μύσιον Ἀκέστερον ἀναπέπεικεν ἀκολουθεῖν ὁμοίως. Lege—ὃν οὐ Κοινῶς ξένον ἀλλαμυσον οἶδα Μυσίω, Ἀκέστορ ἀναπέπεικεν ἀκολουθεῖν ἐμοί—καί, Ὡς πολῖται, δεῖνὰ πάσχω. Τίς πολίτης δ’ ἐστὶ σοὶ Πλὴν Ἀρσάκας ὁ Μυσὸς καὶ τὸ Καλλίου νόθον. Lege Πλὴν Σάκας Μυσὸς τ’ Ἀκέστωρ καὶ τὸ— Inter quæ ἀλλαμυσον est vel ἀλλὰ Μυσὸν vel ἀλλ’ ἄμουσον. Et Σάκας et Ἀκέστωρ erant Mysii.

1246. Ad πολλὰ δὲ διεκόμεσας adscripsit Schol. Τοῦτο, φησὶν, ἐπάξω πρὸς τὸ σκόλιον Αἰσχίνου, ἐπεὶ κομπαστὴς ἦν. Recte hoc. Ad Av. 823. Τὰ τ’ Αἰσχίνου γ’ ἅπαντα monet Schol. ὅτι οὗτος πένης, θρυπτόμενος καὶ αὐτὸς ἐπὶ πλούτῳ—καὶ λέγων ἑαυτὸν πλούσιον. Idem fuit, sicut Theagenes teste Schol. Av. 823 et 1126, dictus καπνὸς, teste Schol. ad Vesp. 324. unde, ut id obiter moneam, bene intelligas Vesp. 151. Ὅστις πάτρος νῦν τοῦ καπνίου κεκλήσομαι. Haud male igitur erui διεκόμεσας σύ γ’ ἐκ καπνοῦ. Quibus verbis, fortasse e carmine quodam Acestoris desumptis, intelligi hoc voluit

Comicus, quod Acestor, jactationibus Æschinis inductus, cum profectus esset Thessaliam lucri causa, et redisset inops, Æschinem incusabat et illum una cum vocibus ejus fumo comparabat.

1265 et sqq.

πολλάκις δὴ ᾿δοξ' ἑμαυτῷ δεξιὸς πεφυκέναι,
καὶ σκαιὸς οὐδεπώποτε,
ἀλλ' Ἀμυνίας ὁ μαλλὸς (Κρωβύλου δ' οὐ ζεῦγος ἦν)
πεινῇ γάρ, ἥπερ Ἀντίφων
αὐτὸς, ὃν γ' ἐγὼ ποτ' εἶδον ἀπὸ τε μήλου καὶ ῥοίας
δειπνοῦντα μετὰ Λεωγόρου—

5

ἀλλὰ πρεσβέων γὰρ εἰς Φύρσαλον
᾿ῶχετ'· εἴτ' ἐκεί μόνος μόνοισι
τοῖς Πενέσταισιν ξυνῆν, τῶν Θετταλῶν
αὐτὸς ὦν πένης ἐλάττων οὐδένομος.

10

V. 3. Vulgo ὁ Σέλλου μᾶλλον οὐκ τῶν κρωβύλου. At monuit Schol. Selli filium esse Æschinem et non Amyniam: uterque tamen erant valde hirsuti, alter dictus Κομητ-Αμυνίας in Vesp. 464. (ubi ineptit Schol.) ideoque hic dici potest μαλλὸς (—vel ἡ καθειμένη κόμη ut apud Euripid. Bacch. 113. λευκοτρίχων πλοκάμων μαλλοῖς): alter quoque dici potest κρώβυλος, ut Hegesippus apud Hesychium sic ope codicis legendum: Κρώβυλος, ὁ μαλλὸς τῶν παίδων ἢ ὁ κόρυμβος· ἐκ πλοκῆς γὰρ ἔστιν ἡ ἀνηνεγμένη [κόμη] ἀπὸ μέσου τοῦ μετώπου ἐπὶ τὴν κορυφὴν· οὕτω δὲ καὶ ὁ ῥήτωρ Ἠγήσιππος—ἐκαλεῖτο. Potest quoque dici Κρωβύλου ζεῦγος, sensu duplici. Etenim fuit Κρωβύλου ζεῦγος, utpote gereus duos crimium nodos: necnon Κρωβύλου ζεῦγος eatenus, quod Æschines et Crobulus erant par ignobile. Suid. Κρωβύζου ζεῦγος· ἐπὶ τῶν ἐπὶ κακία καὶ πονηρία σπενδομένων. Τοῦτο δὲ εἴρηται ἀπὸ κρωβύζου πορνοβοσκοῦ τινος, δύο ἔχοντος ἐταίρας ἐπὶ ὀλέθρῳ πολλῶν· κρωβύζου οὖν ζεῦγος ἐπὶ διασύρματι δύο ὁμονοούντων· οὓς πρότερον τοῦ ἀναπνεῖν φασιν ἢ τοῦ κακουργεῖν παύσασθαι. Verum ibi emendatur Κρωβύλου ex Hesychio, Κρωβύλου ζεῦγος. Παροιμία ταττομένη ἐπὶ τοῖς ὑπερβαλλούσῃ κεχρημένοις πονηρίᾳ. Μετενήνεκται δὲ ἀπὸ πορνοβοσκοῦ τινος. At gl. habet Harpocraton utilissimam ad emendanda Hesychii verba in Κρώβυλος—οὕτω δὲ Ἠγήσιππος καὶ δηγγος ἐκαλεῖτο Κρώβυλος. Καὶ ὁ μαλλὸς τῶν αἰδοίων: sed Harpocraton exhibet Κρώβυλος Αἰσχίνης ἐν τῷ κατὰ Κτησιφῶντος Ἠγήσιππος μὲν ἔστιν ὁ Κρώβυλος ἐπικαλούμενος. At fuit olim ibi Κρώβυλος Αἰσχίνης [μὲν ἐν Σφηξίν] ἐν δὲ τῷ κατὰ Κτησιφῶντος Ἠγησίππος ὄνομ' ἔστιν ἐπικαλούμενος: lege igitur in Hesychio καὶ Αἰσχίνης ζεῦγος ἐκαλεῖτο Κρωβύλου. Unde intelligi potest Σέλλου esse gl. ab ejus manu, qui bene uoverat per Κρωβύλου ζεῦγος innui τὸν Σέλλου. Haud male igitur ex μᾶλλον οὐκ τῶν erui potest μᾶλλ' ὅσον κόμων, qui tamen, μαλλὸς excepto, est interpretis foetus, sicut ὁ Σέλλου. V. 4. Vulgo οὗτος. At non Amynias fuit olim dives, verum Antipho: qui postea ad paupertatem redactus est; neque divitias iterum sibi comparavit: quod sane

facere potuisset, si legationem obiisset. Vid. Schol. ad Ach. 66. et Casaubon. in Theophrast. *περὶ βδελυρίας*, ad verba τὸ μὲν ἐκ τῆς πολέως ἐφόδιον. Hanc tamen se ditandi occasionem, adeo σκαιὸς erat Amynias, qui penitus negligeret. Ille enim Pharsalum missus, rediisse videtur inops, infecta legatione. Id colligi potest e fragmento Eupolidis apud Schol. sic legendo *Κ' Αμυνίας ἐκείνος* Ἀμελεῖ κλαύσεται, "Ὅτι, ἄτ' ἀγροῖκος, ἴσταται πρὸς τὰ μορίων. Παθέων δ' ἔνεχ' ὧν ἔπλευσε, κακὸς ὧν εἴσεται. Ubi deest ατ' ob ατ: at id redde utpote: mox e τω μορίῳ οτι θεων ενεκα επλ—erui τα μοριων παθεων ενεκα επλ—. Etenim Amynias res facere voluit, sed perficere nequivit, utcumque κατὰ τὰ μόρια crinitus. Unde de Amynia fit proverbium. Οὐδείς κομήτης, ὅστις οὐ περαίνεται—vel ψηνίζεται. Eam tamen se ditandi occasionem non neglexit Æschines. V. 3. μήλου καὶ ροιᾶς inquit Schol. ἐπὶ τῶν δαψιλῶν ὄψων—ineptum igitur est ἀντί: quasi Leogoras aliquid pro cibis lautis suffecisset, qui fuit gulæ perditæ amans. Reposui igitur ἀπό τε. V. 10. Vulgo πενέστης contra metrum et sensum. Collato Suid. v. Πενέσταις, vide annon præstet Πενήταισιν propter lusum vice πενέσταισιν.

1275 et sqq. στρ.

1284 et sqq. ἀντιστρ.

} Ita exstant in Kust.

1326 et sqq.

στρ.

ἀντιστρ.

ἄνεχε πάρεχε, δίλαγε, πάραγε,
κλαύσεταιί τις τῶν ὀπισθεν
ἐπακολουθούντων ἐμοί·

οἶον, εἴ μὴ ῥήσῃθ', ὑμᾶς
ὦ πόνηροι ταύτηϊ τῇ
δαδὶ φρυκτοὺς σκευάσω.

V. 1. Voces δίλαγε πάραγε, hic omissas, agnoscit Comicus in Av. 1717.

1335 et sqq.

ἰοῦ ἰοῦ καλούμενοι
τάρχαϊά γ' ὑμῶν ἄρ' ἔτ', ἴσθ',
ὡς οὐδ' ἀκούων ἀνέχομαι·
ΔΙΚΩΝ δ' ΙΑΙΒΟΙ, τάδε μ' ἀρέσκ-
ει, ΒΑΛΛ', ΑΙ-
ΒΟΙ, ΚΗΜΟΡΣ'.

1450 et sqq. στρ.

1462 et sqq. ἀντιστρ.

} Ita Kust. e Schol.

1518 et sqq.

ἄγε μεγαλώνυμ' ὦ
τέκνα τοῦ θαλασσίου
πηδᾶτε παρὰ ψάμαθον
καὶ θῖν' ἀλὸς ἀτρυγέτοι-
ο καρίδων ἀδελφοί.
ταχὺν πόδ' ἐν κύκλῳ σοβ-
εῖτε καὶ τὸ
Φρυνίχειον
ἐκλακτισάτω τις, ὡς ἴδοντες
ἄνω σκέλος ὕζωσ' οἱ θεαταί.

5

10

V. 9. Ita Benth. pro ἄδοντες. Metrum confirmat. Eadem var. lect. in Vesp. 319. ex emendatione Dawesii. V. 10. Pro ὄζωσ' dedi ὄζωσ' : quod formatur ab ὄ : hoc exstat in Plut. 896. ubi Schol. ὁ ὄ ὁσφραϊνόμενος τοῦτό φησι.

1528 et sqq. Vid. Gaisford ad Hephæst. p. 341.

Etonæ Dabam, Kalend. Feb. A. S. MDCCCXVII.

DE VIOLATIS REGUM SEPULCRIS,

IIIDEMQUE

A REGE CHRISTIANISSIMO RESTITUTIS.

CARMEN.

QUIS ille tantus impulit mentes furor?
 Quid arma, quid sibi volunt
 Facesque vectesque, et ruinarum artifex,
 Ira jubente, malleus?
 An Marte captas hostium sedes juvat
 Et ferro et igne vertere;
 Longique pœnas exigere belli, et gravem
 Pensare damno injuriam?
 Tantum o scelestis adsit hic cœptis color,
 Hoc fine consistat nefas!
 Sed major animis æstuat vetiti fames,
 Vulgare temnitur scelus;
 Placet quod ætas nulla viderit prior,
 Futura quod factum neget.
 Denso vetustas obsidet templi fores
 Grex turbulentus agmine,
 Templi quod umbris ultimam regalibus
 Domum sacravit Gallia.
 Hic ante vivi numinis placabiles
 Aras, ubi vicario
 Mortalis ævi diluit piacula
 Redemptor agnus sanguine;
 Inter calentes thure votivo focos
 Ac nesciam somni precem,
 Sociis quiescunt ossa regum sedibus,
 Mutusque supplicat cinis.
 Heu! quanta eodem generis ac famæ bona,
 Quanta ingeni et formæ rapax

Libitina clausit ! Invido sub marmore
 Passim reconditum jacet
Illustre quidquid, liliis prægnantibus,
 Tot prodidere sæcula ;
Regesque regumque in thoros missæ nurus,
 Thorisque nata pignora.
Omnis sepulcro consecratur angulus,
 Omnis tenet nomen lapis.
Quisquamne lacrymis vacuus hoc silentium,
 Hæc ingredi busta audeat ?
Quisquamne mœstis ultimum vale et pias
 Negare manibus preces ?
Immo quietas, impetu facto, domos
 Irrumpit insolens cohors,
Nil templi honore, nil et hospitis Dei
 Præsente sensu territa.
Tremuit scelesto pressa tellus agmine,
 Imisque redditum gemit
Lugubre tumulis murmur, extinctis diem
 Mersere flammis lampades.
O mortuorum sacra, vel sævissimis
 Intaminata gentibus !
O sceptrâ populis rapta citius, et rogo
 Superstes in reges amor !
Veterum sepulcris principum nefariam
 Incesta plebs manum injicit,
Partita facinus. Ille adactis marmora
 Convellit ægre vectibus ;
Hic illigato fune regias trahit
 Imagines, et pulveris
Inane titulos frigidi solatium
 Sacro refigit parjete.
Rimantur alii saxo humove conditos
 Manes, profundæque intimum
Penetrâle mortis, ac suprema polluant
 Jacentium cubilia.
Vi multa ad auras protrahuntur sutili
 Inclusa plumbo funera,
Quæ circum hiant turba substitit metu,
 Vix ausa ferrum impingere.
Confirmat animos tandem, et hortatur manum,
 Ictuque vulnus exigit.
Mille insequuntur vulnera, hybernâ minus
 Densat procella grandinem.
Fatiscit impar mallei sub verbere
 Custos silentum lamina,

Proditque manes : corpora apparent virum
 Pars tabe confecta et situ,
 Absentis aliquam pars imaginem exhibet
 Vitæ, quiescentem putes.
 Parcite, scelesti; quid patrum meruit cinis,
 Regum quid umbra ? parcite.
 Vos prisca moveat, pallidis quæ frontibus
 Nec tota majestas abest ;
 Oculique vestris unde lex majoribus
 Expressa nutu prodiit,
 Quæque arma, quæque sceptrâ victrices pari
 Cum laude gesserunt manus.
 Nescit moveri vulgus atrox, parcere
 Nescit : vetustis corpora
 Spoliata pannis plumbeo de carcere
 Nefandus exturbat furor ;
 Cœloque teste, consciis altaribus,
 Inter sepulcrorum erutas
 Moles, et ipsa regiones artis dolo
 Mentita vultus marmora,
 Scriptique tabulas æris, informes sacro
 Artus pavimento aggerit.
 Jacuere nudo, flebile examen, solo
 Bustis revulsi principes,
 Quicumque bello protulere Gallicos
 Fines et imperi decus ;
 Quicumque justis, literato in otio,
 Rexere gentem legibus.
 Hic ille Lodoix Africo quem littore
 Vis dura fati perculit,
 Pietate et armis nobilem, cœlestibus
 Nunc et choris jure additum.
 Alterque Lodoix, dulce cni *Populi Pater*
 Cognomen ex re contigit.
 Et, quo favente literarum fontibus
 Imbuta primum Gallia,
 Franciscus ; et quo Gallicis nullum auribus
 Acceptius nomen sonat,
 Nullumve memori pectore altius sedet,
 Exemplar Henricus ducum.
 Quid jam Philippos Carolosve, quid suo
 Lætum Pipinum Carolo ;
 Aliosve referam quotquot heroas vetus
 Hic abditos pressit lapis ?
 Hic ipsæ ademto regiæ velo nurus :
 Quid deinde restat auxili,

Quas jam latebras heu ! miser captes pudor,
 Sepulcra cum fallant fidem ?
 Tene, unde tantum proximo sæclo decus,
 O magne magnorum ultime,
 Tene his ego oculis hic quoque effossos super
 Agnosco projectum patres ?
 Nec parta bello gloria, nec artes tuis
 Plenæ juvant honoribus ;
 Et quæ potentis ingeni miracula
 Nunquam silebunt literæ ?
 Cognata recubant funera, hinc te filio
 Superba nequicquam parens ;
 Illinc nepotum turba, primis ad rogos
 Elata de cunabulis.
 Quos inter, avida Galliæ expectatio,
 Burgundionum dux puer
 Felicitatem, heu vana spes ! in publicam
 Docto eruditus Præsuli.
 Teritur profano regium vulgus pede,
 Nec eruisse jam satis :
 Lacerare certum est, ac Notis furentibus
 Jactanda membra effundere ;
 Certum est, cruentæ deditus postquam neci
 Regum occidit novissimus,
 Prioris ævi dissipare pulverem
 Nec mortuos reges pati.
 Repetit jacentum corpora impius furor
 Ac mille distrahit modis,
 Fœdatque vastatque, ac per immensa atria
 Curvasque longe porticus
 Raptata, ad ipsas, horridum visu ! fores
 Nudo sub æthere abjicit.
 Cumulatur ingens strage confusa locus,
 Quem ros et imber proluant,
 Venti fatigent, solis accendat vapor :
 Hoc exules placet solo
 Dammare manes, pristinis sic regibus
 Memor parentas Gallia !
 Et otiosi tela cessant fulminis !
 Quid ultor expectas Deus ?
 An ut tuis te (crastina hoc forsán dies
 Videbit) aris exuant ?
 Tuos amaris interim Christos libet
 Vexare contumeliis :
 Carent sepulcro, vilibus pannis carent
 Quos nec peremtis hostibus

Victoris ira, nec peregrino invidet
 Ignotus hospes hospiti.
 Nudo sub axe principes, nuda super
 Tellure porrecti jacent ;
 Notus ossa regum versat ! ah saltem pio
 Defende soles pulveri,
 Defende ventos, cujus ad nutum æquora
 Pressis residunt fluctibus.
 Leviora posco : quid moror, parcus spei,
 Votis habenas mittere ?
 Majora teque digna præstabis, Deus,
 Horum nec ossa deserēs.
 En ipse melior se futuri temporis
 Ultro revelat exitus.
 Sperate, cineres regii : dies erit
 (Hanc detur utinam cernere !)
 Qua, post acerba civium certamina,
 Post externam belli facem,
 Atque irruentis pondus Europæ, graves
 Ab hoste pœnas dum rapit,
 Vestros honores illa rursus erigat
 Quæ Galliam eriget manus.
 Quot illa quantisque heu ! mederi cladibus,
 Quot alligare vulnere ;
 Quos nata motus pectorum compescere,
 Quos ferre sortis impetus !
 Non aliud unquam Gallicis præsentius
 Terris levamen obtigit.
 Non ille, magnos inter ac bonos pari
 Florens honore principes,
 Ille, et suorum victor et dictus pater,
 Qui demisit obsessis famem
 Henricus, excelsæ indoli plus commodæ
 Humanitatis miscuit,
 Fessisve plura contulit populis bona
 Ipse et malorum haud inscius ;
 Quam tu labanti tot procellis Galliæ,
 Desiderate, conferes
 O Ludovice, culmen ad rerum aspera
 Sortis malignæ de schola
 Tandem remittet supera quem benignitas,
 Et mitior Gallis Deus.
 Plaudetis ultro principis laboribus,
 Plaudetis, umbræ nobiles,

Cum pace terris æquorique præstita,
 Pacem daturus alteram,
 Regnique jura populique arbiter novo
 Discriminabit fœdere,
 Vim temperatis mitigatam legibus
 Hinc firmiorem cogitans;
 Plaudetis, atra cum obsitos rubigine
 Mores nitorem in pristinum
 Revocare, cumque vitio lapsa temporum
 Templâ excitare, aut utiles
 Fovere justis disciplinas præmiis
 Studebit, ipsarum sciens.
 Gentile pectus et domesticam indolem
 Juvabit hic agnoscere;
 Vestri juvabit vos nepotis gloria
 Premi, an levâri verius?
 Hæc inter udo sub Jove indignabitur
 Regum jacere funera,
 Sparsos jubebit pulveres recolligi,
 Suisque reddet sedibus:
 Necnon diurnas, more majorum, preces,
 Et quæ nefas sacra expient
 Dicabit heros, vestraque infelicibus
 Reponet aris nomina.
 Quin et revecta dissitis huc e locis
 Curabit augustæ domus
 Funera recondi, sed prius, fratrem ut decet,
 Regnique in ipso limine,
 Tua, sancte martyr, ossa, conjugis et tuæ
 Fortuna quam similis tulit,
 Honore digno consecrata transferet,
 Heu serius piaculum!
 Properate sæclo quæ laboranti decus
 Hoc parturit tempora;
 Vosque hinc minori vindicem cum tædio
 Manete vestrum principes.

ON THE
SAPPHIC AND ALCAIC METRES.

No. IV.—[*Concluded from No. XXX. p. 237.*]

It is more easy to ascertain the existence of a metrical law, than always to be able to assign a reason for it. I suspect, however, that a monosyllable is required *after* a Penthimimer in order to break and disguise the trochaic measure of this colon, which without this art, and the help of this cæsura, would be very weak, and too simple, as

At- | tollat iras | montiumque Burton's opusc. p. 20.

On the contrary, if the colon conclude with an Iambic Penthimimer, and be not preceded by a monosyllable, it would have the defect of beginning and ending in the same manner, in different verses, a consequence that may always be avoided in a colon properly constructed by a careful reader. In the line

Et Faustitas | affusa circum, Ib.

it is very difficult not to pronounce the two concluding words as an Iambic Penthimimer; but the lines,

Consulque | non unius || anni, and De gente | sub Dio || moreris,
are capable of being read, like

Testatur | auditumque || Medis, and Non ante | devictis || Sabææ,
and the Iambic Penthimimer disappears.

The colon therefore is so constructed, that an Iambic Penthimimer may be heard at the beginning, but never at the end. A good reader may redeem the Horatian colon

Hunc Lesbio | sacrare || plectro,

by reading it in this manner

Hunc | Lesbio-sacrare || plectro,

and then the Iambic Penthimimer is no more perceptible at the close, than in

Non | decoloravere | cædes. Lib. 2. O. 1. v. 345.

The very defective line of Buchanan

Pallor, | tremor, terror, || pavorque. Miscell. Od. 13.

may be read like

Visam | pharetratos || Gelonos,

and thus the Iambic Penthimimer at the close may in a great measure be smothered. But a quadrisyllable at the beginning, as

Agnoscito | cultu || timendum. Burton's Opusc. p. 21.

is a hopeless case, and affords no possibility of escape from the concluding Penthimimer, nor do I know any good line at all analogous to it.

Perhaps Horace had another aim than to avoid the appearance of a Penthimimer at the close, and that is, to tie together the trochaic feet.

We have seen, that when the first Ditrochee terminates a whole word, the second Ditrochee must begin with a monosyllable, and thus suffer a Cæsura.

But the more agreeable form is when the two Ditrochees are tied together, and this is done in two ways :

First, by making the *first trochaic* or first foot of the first dipodia terminate a whole word, and then by connecting the first or second syllable of the subsequent Ditrochee with the spondee of the first Ditrochee, by a trisyllable, or monosyllable and dissyllable, or by a quadrisyllable, or monosyllable and trisyllable, as

Virtute | me involvo || probamque
Seu voce | nunc mavis || acuta
Devota | non extinxit || arbor
Culpante | nunc torrentia || agros
Urgentur | ignotique || longa. L. 4. O. 9. v. 27.

Secondly, by beginning the verse with a monosyllable, or dissyllable, or two monosyllables, and by comprehending either the whole or the three last syllables of the first Ditrochee, and the first or second syllable of the second Ditrochee, in one polysyllabic word, as

Sylvæ | laborantes || geluque
Raro | antecedentem || scelestum
Sedes | Atlanteusque || finis
Nunc in | reluctantes || dracones
Non | decoloravere || cædes.

All the verses of Horace are reducible to one or other of the three kinds just mentioned. But it is observable that every colon requires a double pause, a weak and a strong pause.

The first sort have both pauses fixed, the weak on the 5th syllable, the strong on the 6th.

In the second sort, the weak pause is fixed on the 3rd syllable, and the strong may be either on the 6th or 7th.

In the third sort, the weak pause may be either on the first or second syllable, and the strong on the 6th or 7th.

Among the last sort, may be found some of the most agreeable verses, and the second sort are more pleasing than the first. The

second sort, as they suit most words, are by far the most numerous, and of this sort, for the same reason, those colons, that have the pause on the 6th syllable, are more numerous than those that have the pause on the 7th. There is an ingenious and useful table of all the allowed forms of this third verse in the *Classical Journal*, No. xxii. p. 352.

I will introduce here a similar table accommodated to my division of the verse.

- | | | |
|-------|------------------------|------------------------------------|
| 1. A. | — — ∪ — — — ∪ — — | Te triste lignum te caducum. |
| 2. B. | — — ∪ — — — ∪ — — | Unguenta de conchis quis udo. |
| 2. b. | — — ∪ — — — ∪ — — | Utcunque defecere mores. |
| 3. D. | — — ∪ — — — ∪ — — | Nunc in reluctantes dracones. |
| 3. E. | — — ∪ — — — ∪ — — | Portus Alexandria supplex. |
| 3. F. | — — ∪ — — — ∪ — — | Dul- cem elaborabunt saporem. |
| 3. G. | — ∪ — — — ∪ — — | Non decoloravere cædes. |

It is evident from the preceding scheme, that the strong pause falls invariably either upon the first or second syllable of the second Ditrochee.

It is somewhat singular that, although an elision is not allowed at the strong pause in the colons like A, it is admissible in the colons like B, as,

Fortuna | cum stridore || acuto.

But this verse in Buchanan

Vocabit in jus | orbem || ab ortu Ps. 50.

is without any authority.

Indeed this verse labours under another defect, and exhibits a Monosyllable in the *centre*, which intersects and confounds all the preceding schemes of Scansion. It nevertheless frequently occurs in modern Poets, as

Non Indico *qui* stridet arcu, Musæ Cantab. p. 39.

Per dirutas *jam* sævit urbes, Ib.

Custodiam *ponto* incubantem et, Ib. 94.

Quascunque Phryx *hinc* inde plantas, Burton's opusc. p. 322.

Quis asseret, *quis* tradet igni, Musæ Anglic. p. 179.

The last line in the Alcaic Strophe of Horace exhibits four forms. In three of these forms the dactylic Metre is connected with the concluding Ditrochee; in the other, it exhibits the Ditrochee detached from the dactylic measure. When connected with the Ditrochee, it has a pause upon the first syllable of the Ditrochee, as

Flumina constiterint | acuto. L. 1. O. 9. v. 4.

or upon its second syllable, as

Nec veteres agitantur | orni. Ib. v. 12.

Or upon the first syllable of the second dactyl, as

Divitias | operosiores. L. 3. O. 1. v. 48.

When the dactylic measure is separated from the Ditrochee, there is always a double pause, a weak one on the first syllable of the second dactyl, and a stronger on the close of the second dactyl, so that a dissyllable constantly intervenes between the two pauses, as,

Post equitem | sedet || atra cura.
 Conjuge me | Jovis || et sorore.
 Regum apices | neque || militum arma.

I only know of two exceptions to the preceding forms, and they are capable of explanation. One is,

Fallere et effugere est triumphus,

but the elision here in some measure satisfies the ear, and *effugere-est* is to be read together as one word; and then this line is like

Flumina constiterint | acuto.

In a similar manner the line

Sors exitura et | nos || in æternum

is not to be ranked among the lines beginning with a quadrisyllable, but *exitura et* is to be considered as coalescing, and then this line resembles

Vix illigatum | te || triformi.

The other exception is,

Nominis Asdrubale inter-emto,

which may be reconciled by a tmesis of the compound, and then it would appear like

Longius invidiæque | major L. 2. O. 20. v. 4.

The following lines exhibit a trisyllable, where Horace invariably uses a dissyllable.

Nec meritæ | decora || alta famæ. Musæ Cantab. p. 12.
 Ætheriæ | Omina || fausta flammæ. Ib. p. 16.

I now pass to the subject of hiatus, or rather the elision of the long vowel in Latin, as the Latin language in this respect differs from the Greek, and requires all vowels to be elided. Horace has used in this metre nearly the same caution as in the Sapphic. He chiefly elides the long vowel, where it is least perceptible, at the pause, or before a monosyllable, particularly at the end of a pause, or colon, as

Quo Styx et invisi | horrida Tænari
 Vitamque sub Dio | et trepidis agat
 Neglectus incesto | addidit integrum
 Marti redonabo | illum ego lucidas
 Farre pio | et salente mica
 Sæpe mero | incaluisse virtus
 Vim stomacho | apposuisse nostro
 Vulcanus hinc Matrona Juno et.

Decedit æratâ triremi *et*
 Judex honestum prætulit utili *et*
 Quando *et* priores hinc Lamias ferunt
 Vultu *et* per obstantes catervas
 Juno *et* Deorum quisquis amicior
 Seu te *in* remoto gramine per dies
 Vino *et* lucernis Medus acinaces
 Descende cœlo *et* | dic age tibia
 Matura virgo *et* | fingitur artubus
 Jamdudum apud me *est* | eripe te moræ.

The following elisions do not fall under the same predicament as the preceding :

Virtute mē involvo probamque
 Tu lene tormentum ingeniō admoves
 Miles redibit flagitiō additis
 Ritu feruntur nunc mediō alveo
 Vis consiliī expers mole ruit suâ
 Relinquit ales nequitiā additis.

In *all* the preceding instances there is one general characteristic, that the elision of the long vowel takes place only upon a *long* syllable. When this elision takes place upon a syllable required to be short, it is quite a different case, and of such an elision, I believe, not more than two instances can be found in all the Alcaic Odes of Horace ; and in both these instances the elision is before a *mono-syllable*, and at the *beginning* of the verse, where licences most frequently occur. They are,

Ut tutō ãb Afris corpore viperis. L. 3. O. 4. v. 17.
 Tentabō ãt arentes arenas. Ib. v. 31.

It may be observed too, that the first instance is in the *first* colon of the Strophe, and that both occur in a very long Ode, *longum melos*, as Horace himself calls it. Perhaps too, the *o* in *tentabo* may be thought common. Our grammars, I think, call it so, and dăbō is the termination of a dactyl in Catullus. But as *dabo* makes dăbīs, and dăbīt, it is not quite analogous to *tentabo*, and, I suspect, it will be difficult to find good authority for making the *o* short.¹

I shall now leave it to others to determine how far the following elisions are consistent with the usage of Horace.

Sic nymphæ ãœæ per morientium. Musæ Angl. v. 2. q. 38.
 Potandī ãvente porrigit ubera. Ib. p. 172.
 Gratare | Constantinō || ũtrique. Ib. v. 1. p. 1.
 Tot vestri ãmoris pignora debeat. Buchanan. Miscell. Od. 3.
 Vulgī hūmiles tenuis querelas. Ib. Od. 4.

¹ Contrary to the generality of grammarians, Dr. Valpy, in his Latin Grammar, joins *o* final with *a*, *i* and *u*, as long, in the general rule. He is certainly justified by the practice of the Augustan age.

Cessere saltus pinguidi ſt Alpium. Ib. Ode 1.

Nelsoni inhærens gloria viribus. Musæ Cantab. p. 17.

Catullus seems to admit without much scruple the elision of a long vowel before a short one, as

Et corpus evirastis Veneris nimiō ōdio. Carm. 61. v. 17.

Furibunda, simul anhelans, vaga vadit, animō ēgens. Ib. v. 31.

But Horace would have thought it no compliment to have had his lyrics compared with those of Catullus.

It remains only for me to speak of the final syllable of the different colons of the Alcaic Strophe. The four colons of this strophe, like those of the Sapphic, form together but one line, and therefore a hiatus of a *short* vowel at the end of each colon is not admissible. There are, I believe, in all the odes but two examples to the contrary, namely,

Dii me tuentur, Diis pietas meā || Et Musa cordi est; Hic tibi copia.

L. 1. O. 17. v. 13.

Spargisse nocturno cruorē || Hospitis ille venena Colcha. L. 2. O. 13. v. 7.

In the third verse, not only is the hiatus of a short vowel forbidden, but an elision is permitted, as

Sors exitura et nos in æternū || Exiliū inpositura cymbæ. L. 2. O. 3. v. 27.
Cum pace delabentis Etruscū || In mare nunc lapides adesos. L. 3. O. 29. v. 36.

This licence, which Horace has used only twice in his four books, his imitators do not scruple to employ as often in a single ode. They have improved likewise upon their Original, and, while Horace has elided only a trisyllable, they elide a dissyllable, and quadrisyllable. Nor have they stopped here, but some of them join the two last colons of the strophe together, in imitation of what is allowed in the concluding verses of the Sapphic Strophe, a liberty wholly without example in Horace. He never makes the concluding word of one colon in the Alcaic Strophe extend itself into the succeeding colon, so as to create a junction of the two; and all those, who do not aspire at a higher degree of eminence, than what Horace has attained in this Metre, will do well to be satisfied with his standard.

It may be seen from a review of the versification of Horace, what infinite labor he took to adapt the Latin language to the expression of the Greek lyrical measures, especially those of Sappho and Alcæus; *verba sequi fidibus modulanda Latinis*. His Alcaics alone constitute one fourth of all his lyrical compositions, and it is upon his success in the structure of his odes in general, but particularly of his Alcaic odes, that he builds his expectation of immortality. I will draw together several scattered passages to this effect, as so

many records of himself, and of his own efforts to establish a right to the high title of a lyric poet.

—neque tibia
Euterpe cohibet, nec Polyhymnia
Lesboum refugit tendere barbiton.
Quod si me *Lyricis Vatis* inseres,
Sublimi feriam sidera vertice. L. 1. O. 1. v. 33.

Neu forte credas interitura, quæ,
Longe sonantem natus ad Aufidum,
Non ante vulgatas per artes
Verba loquor socianda chordis.

—Ego Diis amicum,
Seculo festas referente luces,
Reddidi carmen, docilis modorum
Vatis Horati. L. 4. O. 6. v. 41.

Phæbe qui Xantho lavis amne crines,
Daunia defende decus Camæne
Lævis Agyieu.
Spiritum Phæbus mihi, Phæbus *artem*
Carminis, nomenque dedit *Poetae*. Ib. v. 26.

Poscimus, si quid vacui sub umbra
Lusimus tecum, quod et hunc in annum
Vivat, et plures; age, dic Latinum,
Barbite, carmen,
Lesbio primum modulate civi. L. 1. O. 32. v. 1.

—Hunc fidibus *novis*,
Hunc *Lesbio* sacrare plectro,
Teque tuasque decet sorores. L. 1. O. 26. v. 10.

Dicar, quæ violens obstrepit Aufidus,
Et quæ pauper aquæ Daunus agrestium
Regnavit populorum, ex humili potens
Princeps *Æolium* carmen ad Italos
Deduxisse modos. Sume superbiam
Quæsitam meritis. L. 3. O. 30. v. 10.

Sed, quæ Tibur aquæ fertile præfluunt,
Et spissæ nemorum comæ,
Fingent *Æolio* carmine nobilem. L. 4. O. 3. v. 10.

Totum muneris hoc tui est,
Quod monstror digito prætereuntium,
Romanæ fidicen Lyræ. Ib. v. 22.

In his epistles he harps upon the same string :

Ac ne me foliis ideo brevioribus ornes
Quod timui mutare *modos*, et carminis *artem*.
Temperat Archilochi musam pede mascula Sappho,
Temperat Alcæus. L. 1. Ep. 19. v. 26.
Discedo Alcæus puncto illius. L. 2. Ep. 2. v. 99.

The sense of his own superiority in metrical attainments is not less discoverable in the sneers and covert attacks which he makes upon the rude and inartificial numbers of Lucilius, Plautus, and others.

Nempe in composito dixi pede currere versus

Lucili.

L. 1. Sat. 10. v. 1.

At vestri proavi Plautinos et numeros ei

Laudavere sales. De Arte Poet. v. 270.

Quam non adstricto percurrat pulpita socco. L. 2. Epist. 1. v. 174.

It must be owned that he has himself set a most successful example of that polish, and unwearied aim at perfection, which he so strongly recommends to others :

Nec virtute foret, clarisve potentius armis

Quam linguâ Latium, si non offenderet unum-

Quemque Poetarum limæ labor, et mora. Vos O

Pompilius sanguis, carmen reprehendite, quod non

Multa dies et multa litura coercuit, atque

Perfectum decies non castigavit ad unguem. Ib. v. 289.

But although in the structure of his versification the art of Horace is consummate, it is no where apparent and obtrusive, and in the midst of all his chains he displays a grace and freedom that are truly captivating and surprising. It is this laboured ease, this studied negligence (*curiosa felicitas*) which Petronius has seized as displaying the genuine character of the Muse of Horace. Whoever expects to arrive at the same success must submit to the same severity of discipline,

Ludentis speciem dabit, et torquebitur.

At the same time, these restraints, instead of suppressing the powers of genius, rather serve as a stimulant, and open a field for the exhibition of taste and refinement, and for the truth of this, I may appeal to experience; and it will be found that among the modern imitators of Horace, those, who make the nearest approach to his purity of versification, appear to have caught most also of his manner and spirit.

In proportion as metrical science advances, the merit of the ancient poets becomes more conspicuous, and an additional charm is elicited from the perusal of their compositions which was not perceived before. Notwithstanding the light that has lately been thrown on this subject by Dawes, Bentley, Burges, Huntingford, Porson, Burney, and Tate, many of the ancient poets have still reason to complain,

Non apparere labores

Nostros, et tenui deducta poemata filo.

J. B. M.

A CRITICAL

Examination of certain modern opinions respecting the TROAD, and the descriptions of HOMER; and an inquiry into the authorities on which they have been founded.

BY CHARLES H. PARRY, M. D., F. R. S., &c.

No. II.—(Continued from No. XXX. p. 349.)

*The Rivers of the Troad.*¹ The Scamander flowed into the sea where this formed a wide bay, (εὐρὺς κόλπος, Φ. 125.) All the epi-

¹ It would be fortunate for the progress of civilization and happiness, if the ill effects of prejudice were never more productive of injury than in their bearing upon the present discussion, and could as safely furnish topics for ridicule and amusement, as they will be found to do in relation to the paltry streams of Simois and Scamander. To what effusions of the imagination, to what rejection of all authority, and perversion of palpable and intelligible sense, has this baneful passion given rise upon the present occasion! "Chevalier and Liston, (observes Mr. Dalzel, *Plaine de Troie* illustrated T. R. E. S. iv. 49.) crossed the Scamander on a willow!!" This is a happy instance of complacency under an imaginary conclusion deduced from false premises. He adds: "the account of the Scamander by Chevalier and other respectable travellers answers perfectly to all the descriptions and hints to be found in the *Iliad*; allowance being always to be made for the poetic way of representing such things." As after many careful examinations of all the parts of the *Iliad* relating to the Scamander, I have never been able to discover a hint of correspondence with the descriptions to which allusion is here made, I am happy to add my testimony in favor of the full allowance that must always be made to the influence of a poetical imagination. Professor Heyne, however, far outstrips all competition. ποτάμῳ ἐπὶ δινῆεντι. (viii. 490.) "What river (says the Professor) could this be? The Scamander is termed δινῆεις, eddying; but the Simois was still more so. Yet if the Scamander had its course obliquely through the plain, it must be the river here intended." Whence all this doubt and astonishment? Is not the Scamander always so described? Do we ever meet with a similar account of the Simois? Does not Homer himself tell us this river was the Scamander?

Chevalier's references in favor of the "rapid Simois," are to Il. xii. 21, 22. xxi. 307. which passages are, however, totally silent as to this quality.

thets connected with it are expressive of the size and violence of the stream, and distinguish it as μέγας ποταμὸς βαθυδίνης (Υ. 73.) in opposition to the Simois the negative qualities of whose current entitle it to the honours of no adjunct. The Edinburgh Reviewer, following up Prof. Heyne's views, gives us probably the real sense of a passage which has in all times been adopted to prove the insignificance of the Scamander. It does not appear, indeed, that Homer formed a bridge across the whole channel with his single elm. The μὴν αὐτὸν (Φ. 245.) can have but two antecedents, Κρημνὸς or Achilles, under the use of either of which it can have no reference to the opposite bank. The contrary supposition has long remained the seemingly unanswerable argument in proof of the narrowness of the stream, and the inconsistency of Homer.¹

That the Scamander was south of the Simois, appears from the circumstance that, in her way from Olympus, Juno first reached this latter river, and fed her horses on its banks.

The ford of the Scamander was between Troy and the Grecian camp (Ω. 692. Φ. 1. &c.) Homer gives us no information as to the existence of, or necessity for, any other fords, either on this river or the Simois.² Much, however, has been presumed on this subject by modern authors. According to Major Rennell's Map (II.) the night adventures of Ulysses and Diomed must have been impossible. We know from Homer that they did not cross at the ford of the Scamander, as this

An author who considers the μητέρα θήρων (viii. 47.) in connexion with Ida, to allude to "fallow deer," may say any thing. (p. 60.) It is curious that this rapid, eddying Simois, this impetuous river should be dry in the summer, except under occasional rains. (104.) The same fate attended the unfortunate Scamander, notwithstanding all the distinguishing epithets of Homer. Chevalier (p. 24.) talks of the dry channel of the Scamander. The willow bridge was surely a superfluity which might have been spared!

¹ Heyne observes (Not. in Il. Φ. 245, 6.) "γεφύρωσεν δὲ μὴν αὐτὸν ipsum fluvium: proprie is qui jungit utramque ripam tanquam ponte, nunc saltem partem alvei quâ ille in ripam eniteretur, ulmo in alveum prolapso, tum tandem enisus ex alveo Achilles, &c. &c." Rennell explains the passage by saying the river *hæd* was at that time only filling, an explanation scarcely adequate to the known depth and violence of the stream, at the period under consideration. On γεφύρωσε, see Heyne, Pindar, note Isth. viii. 111.

² The Simois, says Rennell, note 57, must have been in the way between the Grecian Camp and Troy, though never said to oppose an obstacle, (see also the note which follows.)

was in the rear of the Throsmus, upon or near which the Trojan army was encamped, and yet, in order to reach the Thracians, they must actually have passed two rivers, and driven the chariot of Rhesus across both, on their return.

One part of the Scamander ran on a side of the plain opposite to, and at a distance from, that on which the tomb of Ilus was placed. During the pursuit of the Trojans by Ajax across the plain, (Λ. 496. &c.) Hector was at a distance on the left, and on the banks of the Scamander. An additional proof, that this was on the right of the Greeks, may be drawn from the fact, that on the side opposite to that on which Hector was engaged, Paris from the column on the tomb of Ilus had wounded Diomed, and thus given occasion to the subsequent achievements of Ajax.

Notwithstanding all that has been said by Dr. Vincent, Whitaker, Dalzel, Heyne, &c. and notwithstanding the abuse with which they have visited Strabo, and the silly apologies made for Homer himself. Scamander had its source in Mount Ida.* No explanation of an ap-

* The same unnecessary confusion has been admitted with regard to the source of the Scamander, as with regard to its attributes. Prof. Heyne will admit neither Homer nor Strabo as good authorities. "Wood," says he, (Pref. to German Ed. of Chevalier,) "did not perceive that Demetrius of Scepsis, whom Strabo follows, builds in the instance of the sources of the Scamander on mere hypothesis. Demetrius, I imagine, founded it on an erroneous interpretation of Il. xii. 18, &c. which he understood geographically, without considering that he had before him a poet, not a geographer." The lines in question enumerate the rivers

Ὅσσοι ἀπ' Ἰδαίων ὄρων ἅλαδε προρέουσι.

This is specific enough. Heyne, (Exc. in Lib. vi. 304.) makes a tolerably successful attempt to save Homer's credit. "Scamander ex Ida procurrisse dicitur, (xii. 21.) inter alios amnes ex Ida ortos: RECTE, *etsi infra urbem ortus*, siquidem Idæ radices ad plagam littoralem pertinebant, nisi totus ille locus a seriore Rhapsodo subtextus est." Again, "Dictus utique nomine alter Simois, alter Scamander; *ille de montium jugis torrentis more*, aquarum colluvie auctus, interdum alveum suum evagatur. Scamander *limpidus et placidus per herbosa loca* defertur, &c. &c. Omnino in hoc saltem amne patet quantum poeta sibi indulserit in veris quoque ornandis, *adeo magna et mirabilia sunt quæ de eo memorat !!!*" I must be allowed one more passage as to the size of the river. "Quod Scamander, *exiguus amnis*, vorticosus appellatur, mirationem excitat: *δωήντα* tamen dictum vidimus aliquoties jam, B. 817!" (Var. Lectt. and Obs. in Il. xx. 73.) See also not. in Il. Θ. 490.

Both on the size and sources of the Scamander, Rennell has set at rest a

parent difficulty can be more natural than that supplied by the illustrious geographer last mentioned, and since admitted by many excellent critics in the disputed passages X. 147.

Κρουνῶ δ' ἱκανον καλλιῤῥόω, ἔνθαδε πηγαὶ
Δοιαὶ ἀναΐσσουσι Σκαμάνδρου διήεντος.

It may be remarked here that Κρουνῶ¹ and Πηγαὶ are distinguished. At X. 208 we have Κρουνοὺς alone. On 147 the scholiast observes of this word “κυρίως μὲν αἱ ἄρχαι τῶν ῥευμάτων, νῦν οἱ τύποι πω πλύνουσιν.” They may be basons of running water derived from two springs which feed the Scamander. Ἀναΐσσω frequently occurs in Homer, and does not always signify *rise or spring up*. At Δ. 114. it seems to express *rush upon*. Paris is on the ground, and the Trojans are apprehensive lest the Greeks ἀναΐξειαν, should rush upon him before he has discharged his arrow. At Ψ. 733. though the combatants are on the ground, it may as easily be explained rush together, as rise up; and at Ο. 80. it seems only to signify springs, bounds, or rushes forward. There is certainly no precise authority in Homer for considering these two springs as the original sources of the Scamander. In the whole long

question, which, had there been less credit to spare, could never have been safely agitated.

The following observations of Prof. Heyne relate to the Simois chiefly. “The Trojan encampment is accurately delineated. (X. 415. 423.) The troops extended themselves down to the sea. Probably the right wing of the Trojans pointed on the north towards *Rhætæum beyond the Simois*. At the outermost extremity lay the new arrived Thracians and Rhesus. This must have been towards the sea, or the mouth of the Simois, and farther out before the Trojan army towards the Grecian camp; for Ulysses and Diomed who surprised them *went along the stream of the Simois*. Homer does not take notice of their *passing the river*. This, however, they might have done.” Indeed, it may be added, Homer does not give any authority for these suppositions. The reeds and tamarisks may have grown on boggy land, not immediately contiguous to the river. From the same argument it might be proved that Troy itself was immediately on the banks of a river, as (Od. xxiv.) we learn that reeds grew also close to Troy’s lofty wall. In answer to a remark of Rennell, it does not appear from Homer that Diomed and Ulysses “passed the host before they reached the Thracians;” for though at K. 433, it is said Εἰ γὰρ δὴ μέματον Τρώων καταδύναι ὄμιλον, &c. it appears from 469, that they only actually passed διὰ τ’ ἔντα καὶ μέλαν αἴμα, and then αἴψα reached the Thracian auxiliaries.

¹ Κρουνῶ, though its obvious derivation is from κρούω, pulso, &c. may have a relation to κρήνη, from κραίνω, &c.

controversy which has been carried on respecting the merits of the modern discoveries, nothing is more astonishing than the facility and indifference, nay the eager devotion, with which Dalzel, Whitaker, Vincent, and even Heyne, have adopted the errors of Chevalier respecting the μέγα κῆμα of the Simois, and the supposed blunders of Strabo and Homer. It will scarcely be believed that these profound scholars should have built so many important consequences on premises with which the poet is positively unacquainted. So far, indeed, is Homer from warranting their assertions, that he cautiously avoids every hint which may connect any character of power with his description of this stream. The everlasting "silver Simois" of Pope, however innocent, is just as superfluous as the "gentle" Xanthus is unnatural and adverse to the truth of history. It is somewhat singular that Mr. Bryant (*Observ. on Morrit.* p. 59.) should object to Chevalier and Dalzel the non-existence of a passage, relating to the Simois, which, though not in the seventh, may be met with in the twelfth Book (*M.* 22.) but this is not half so singular, as that Prof. Dalzel should derive from this very passage the peculiar character he has assigned this river. The acute Bryant should, however, have had no occasion to surrender the passage, *Φ.* 308. He certainly needed not to have considered this whole description as an unserviceable poetic fiction, nor to have confessed that no argument could have been drawn from an apologue. I cannot help thinking that this very apologue proves the point in question, the insignificance of the Simois.¹ Under his customary feeble state he was little able to assist his brother Xanthus, who, therefore, intreats him to call in extraordinary means for increasing his tide. Chevalier (*p.* 104.) was obliged to admit that his Simois, except when assisted by rains, was dried up in the summer season. What torrents must have fallen in the spring or summer, (the season when the banks were covered with flowers) of the tenth year of the Trojan war! The *Edinburgh Reviewer*, (*vi.* 267.) makes an ingenious application of the simile, *Φ.* 257, by supposing that Achilles opened the flood-gates, and turned the course of the stream. Now though this is very far from being "evident,"

¹ Rennell says: "Its bed must have been empty, or very scantily filled when the Scamander calls for its aid." I have omitted to remark in its proper place that this author does an evident injustice to Chevalier, when, at *p.* 91., he supposes the Scamander of Chevalier not to intervene between the Grecian camp and Troy. He might have known that the great real or supposed discovery of the Frenchman was the ancient channel which did so intervene, and thus appeared to solve all previous difficulties.

there is ground for believing that Homer occasionally involved a more precise meaning in his ornamental descriptions, than is usually imagined.

There is no reason deducible from Homer, which necessarily leads to the belief that the confluence of the two rivers was in the neighbourhood of Troy. Mr. Bryant derives his supposed contiguity from the passage, E. 773.

Ἄλλ' ὅτε δὲ Τροίην ἔζον, ποταμῷ τε ρέοντε,

Ἥχι ροὰς Σιμόεις συμβάλλετον ἠδὲ Σκάμανδρος.

In the first place, however, it is assuming too much to suppose that *Τροίην* refers to the city. Secondly, little can be proved from the mere arrangement and contiguity of the words. It can be proved in various instances that the mere poetical collocation was never intended to convey any precise meaning. This may be seen at II. 397, where it is said that Patroclus turns the Trojan phalanxes to the ships and river and wall. If we were to insist upon the propriety of the arrangement, E. 773. it is evident that more would be proved than is required, for in the journey of the goddesses from Olympus, Troy would be nearer the sea than either of the rivers.

In his argument (P. 61. Obs. on Vind.) Mr. Bryant has, singularly enough, omitted all reference to a neighbouring passage by which Homer seems to have pointed out the general relation of places. Juno expressly declares (at 791.) that the battle was *ἐκαθεν πόλιος*, and though she had left her chariot behind her on the banks of the Simois, we have no authority for the supposition that she had travelled far to the spot where the Grecians were engaged.

In proof of the high confluence of the rivers, Major Rennell (59, 60.) says: "Achilles, after the last battle, crossed the Scamander, and that below the conflux, be it where it might, *otherwise* by what road could the Simois have come to its assistance." To this argument there is a safe reply in the remark that it might have travelled the same road as that which the Scamander had itself chosen to inundate the plain, that over its banks, which to the Simois would have been as easy above as below the confluence. "He was in pursuit," continues Rennell, "of a flying enemy, whose army had been drawn up with its right extending to the monument of Ilus, (for it was on the Throsmos) and who had probably been pursued to some distance in the way to Troy before Achilles crossed the river." Nay, Achilles probably crossed the river at the ford, (Φ. 1.) before the army reached the tomb of Ilus, and therefore close to their own encampment. At the ford, or as I interpret it, after passing the ford, Achilles divides the Trojan fugitives into two parties; one he

pursues towards the city; another afterwards, in order to escape his anger, plunges into the river. He follows them, and his principal actions occur in the Scamander, which, however, he never crosses again. He returns by means of the elm into the plain which he had left. The current of the inundation must have been in a direction contrary to the natural course of the stream, as it pursued him towards the city. No proof as to the exact place of confluence seems deducible from any of the circumstances hitherto mentioned. "But," says Rennell, "there is one still more in point. Juno and Minerva alight at the conflux with an intent to interfere in the first battle; in which the Trojan army was drawn up at the monument of Batiaea or Myrinna, in front of Troy, not far from the Scæan gate, (59, 60.) One must conclude the Poet would let them down near the field," &c. Admitting that the goddesses descended at the conflux, and that this was near the field of battle, I have already shown that this field was expressly said to be *ἐκαθεν πόλιος*, at a distance from the city, and in absolute contradistinction to the neighbourhood of the Dardanian or Scæan gate, which, when Achilles was with the army, the Trojans never quitted. The conflux would then under this supposition have been also *ἐκαθεν πόλιος*. Nothing is proved even by these passages as to the locality of the conflux, though the distance of the action from the city is sufficiently determined.

I shall conclude this subject with the general remark, that nothing can be more doubtful than the whole theory of the confluence of the streams.¹ With numberless arguments against the supposition, there

¹ Prof. Heyne "formerly thought it probable that Homer meant only a very near approach of the two rivers, not an entire confluence of their streams; but this opinion he had long abandoned." He adds: "it is a perplexing circumstance that neither in the advancing, nor in the retreat, of the armies, is any express mention made of so important a circumstance as crossing the river. Almost all the passages, except perhaps the last, imply that the rivers run on each side." (xvi.) Even in his Homer this author considers it as doubtful, "*Poterat hoc de loco accipi in quo propriiores sibi sunt divergentes ad interiorem campum duo fluvii, ex altioribus locis hinc et inde procurrentes, siu vero de commistis, &c. accipiendum;*" &c. &c. Exc. ad Lib. vi. I may remark that we know little about the *ἱππόδρομος*, except that it reached from the ships to the plain and back again, the circumstances of the race prove it to have been of a considerable extent. Does not this fact remove, in some respect, the possibility of the junction of the rivers?

According to Rennell's plan II. his present course of the Mender, and present summer course of the Shemar or Simois, would fulfil all the purposes of Homer, without any necessity for assuming this very doubtful confluence of the two streams.

is but a single word in a single line of Homer, which might render it probable that he wished to describe a real junction of the waters. To me this line never furnished any such evidence, (E. 773.) and would have just as correct and as philosophical an interpretation, if translated: "When they reached the Troad and the two flowing rivers, that quarter of the country where the Simois and Scamander roll together with parallel or neighbouring currents, into the sea." In the descent of the goddesses from an aerial position, this junction and neighbourhood might be described as appearing more near than it really was, and it may be questioned whether *συμβάλλειν* does actually imply this union of their waters. Of the Thymbris, Thymbræ or Thymbrus, Homer makes no mention, unless the *πρὸς Θύμβρης*, K. 430, explained by the Scholiast, the Thymbræan Plain, so called from Thymbra a place in the Troad, can be converted into this river.

*The Hellespont.*¹ It cannot be shown from Homer that the fable which is supposed to have given its name to this sea was known in

¹ Rennell gives us no opinion on the subject of the Hellespont. He says, (p. 2.) "The Promontories of Rhætæum and Sigæum, with the discharge of the confluent waters from Ida, by an opening between them, are unerring guides to the plain of Troy; hence there is no other river or plain *that opens to the Hellespont* from Ida." Is not this to assume the disputed position of the Hellespont, and to give a place to the river no where assigned it by Homer? Rennell himself (p. 70.) only considers the place implied.

Heyne (and who would not rejoice in an agreement with this critic?) observes, (Ess. on Top. of Il.) "Homer always places the camp on the Hellespont in the more extensive signification of that term, as meaning the northern part of the Ægean sea, (Il. xviii. 150. xxiv. 346. Od. xxiv. 82. Il. vii. 86. xii. 30. xv. 233. xxiii. 2.) and hence should be derived the explanation of the epithets *πλατὺς* and *ἀπείρων*, &c." See also not. in Il. η. 86. p. 432. Ω. 545. Whether the denomination Hellespont was derived from Ἑλλάς Greece at large, (as Pindar Pyth. vii. 7. x. 29. ii. 111.) or from Ἑλλάς the province or city, (Strab. Lib. ix.) or from Helle, or had, as is most probable, an Asiatic derivation, cannot be ascertained. Dionysius Perieg. 515, has the *στεινωπὸν ὕδωρ Ἀθαμάντιδος Ἑλλης*, where Sestus and Abydus are placed on opposite sides. At 131, 5, he speaks of *Αἰγαίου πόντου πλατὺν πόρον*, which ends at Tenedos, and at 821, of the *μέγαν Ἑλλήσποντον*, on which Eustathius observes "ὕπερ τὸν μέγαν ἦτοι τὸν πλατὺν Ἑλλήσποντον ὅ ἐστι νοτιώτερον τοῦ Ἑλλησπόντου." Again, from Mysia the immense elbow (*ἀγκῶν*) of lower Phrygia runs *ἐξ Ἑλλήσποντον* (809). Some Thracians too live at the sides of the Propontis, others on the *Ἑλλήσποντος ἀγάρροος*, the rest on the Ægean Sea. (323, &c.) The southern middle boundary of Europe is the Hellespont *νότιον δὲ μεσούριον Ἑλλήσποντος*. Theocritus Id. xiii. says, the Argonauts came on the third day to the Hellespont, and anchored in a part of the Propontis.

his days. Like that of Iphigenia in Aulis, the invulnerability of Achilles, and many others, it seems to have been of much later invention. If this allegory had existed in his time, it would, however, by no means follow that the term Hellespont was particularly confined to the passage of the Dardanelles. The fable itself gives us small ground for any such particular association. That by Hellespont, Homer did not understand the canal of Abydos, seems easily proved. To omit the Homeric epithets *πλατὺς* and *ἀπείρων*, which certainly establish the interpretation of each other, and which by all the ingenuity of Dr. Vincent cannot be made satisfactorily to express the properties of a streight, nor of Mr. Walpole, without a forced construction, be converted into *salt*, notwithstanding the authorities of Aristotle and Hesychius, Homer himself particularly distinguishes the inhabitants of the Hellespont from those of the supposed streight itself. In the catalogue, B. 845. among the Trojan auxiliaries are enumerated the Thracians *ὄσσους Ἑλλήσποντος ἀγάρροος ἐντὸς ἑέργει*. In a former part of his list he has, however, separately classed together the inhabitants of Percote, Præctium, Sestos, Abydos, and Arisbe. Had not Sestos and Abydos been on opposite sides of the channel, it might have appeared that he only wished to distinguish the European and Asiatic sides. Under this distinction, however, it cannot easily be admitted that his Hellespont was the canal of Abydos. By attempting to reconcile the supposed difficulties, we may, perchance, prove more than is intended, that the whole Propontis was by Homer designated as the Hellespont.

That the terms *πόντος* and *Ἑλλήσποντος* were on the whole used as synonyms, appears probable from many passages.¹ At Ψ. 143. and A. 350. Achilles is said to be *ἰδὼν ἐπὶ οἶνοπα πόντον*, and at I. 360. he expressly says he shall on the following morning embark upon the fishy Hellespont, and reach Phthia in three days. The epithet *ἰχθυόεντα* is not characteristic of the Hellespont. At I. 4. *πόντον ἰχθυόεντα* relates to the sea of Thrace. The *Εὐρέα πόντον* also describes (I. 72.) the sea which was to be navigated from Thrace. From Arcadia the voyage was over the *Πόντος* (B. 613.) and from Athos Juno (Ξ. 229.) passed over the *Πόντον κυμαίνοντα*. The *Εὐρέα πόντον* extends, it is true, as low as Sidon, Z. 290. M. 30. As, however, the Ægean sea was unknown to Homer, there is no ground for supposing that in his time

¹ Pindar furnishes a confirmation of this opinion. At Pyth. iv. 284. we find the commands of *Φριξὸς, Δίρμα σε, κρείου βαθύμαλλον ἄγειν, τῷ ποτ' ἰκ Πόντον σπώθη.*" See a farther confirmation at Ψ. 214. 231.

the whole sea, extending at least between Hellas and the Troad, was not denominated the Hellespont.

The Barrows of the Troad. It is in vain that Mr. Bryant¹ and other writers attempt to maintain that the mounds of the Trojan plain were ancient Thracian or Scythian barrows, founded prior to the era of Troy, and long afterwards appropriated by the Greeks, while we have the express authority of Homer himself describing the foundation of some of these tombs,² and his evidence for the previous existence of others, which he has, indeed, carefully assigned to their respective proprietors. The *τύμβος ἄκριτος ἐν πεδίῳ* or *ἐκ πεδίου* H. 336. 435.³ was constructed very early in the tenth year, for the whole number of dead who had fallen in the previous battles. It was not far distant from, *πρὸς*, (337. 436.) the rampart, and does not occur again by name, or evident allusion.⁴ Is there any connexion between this barrow and the *θρῶσμός πεδίου*? Though the armies have fought near this ground, it is certain that we never hear mention made of the latter till after the construction of the former. I always believed in the identity of the two, and have since discovered that Prof. Heyne was of the same opinion.⁵ There are, however, many reasons why they cannot have been the same. The *τύμβος ἄκριτος* was close to the Grecian wall and towers. Now it is evident, that, though the Trojans were encamped at the Throsmos, (K. 160.) *μεσηγὺ νεῶν, ἣ δὲ Ξάνθοιο ῥοάων* (Θ. 560.) *ἐγγὺς νηῶν καὶ τείχεος* (I. 232.) the *θρῶσμός* was not close to the wall, because the Greeks went beyond the wall, (*τείχεος ἐκτὸς*) where the guards were stationed (I. 67. 87. K. 19. 41.) in order to hold their council; and in their night adventure Diomed and Ulysses had still a considerable distance to proceed before they

¹ Bryant on Chev. 41.

² Homer says those who died at Ilium had tombs raised to them, Od. κxiv. That of Achilles was on a tall Promontory, ib. and Il. vii. 98. At Il. ε. 121, Achilles says *κείσονται ἐπὶ καὶ θάναοι*. From Od. Ω. 37. 40. &c. it appears as if Achilles had died on the plain with his troops around him, many of whom were also slain. There is not a word of the temple of Apollo Thymbræus. Pindar Pyth. iii. 180. says he was killed by arrows, but does not mention Paris.

³ "Quid sit *ἐκ πεδίου* obscurius est. *Vulgaris erat ἐν πεδίῳ*, &c. *Tolerabile saltem est esse dictum pro ἐκτὸς κατὰ τοῦ πεδίου* non interius versus castra, sed extrorsum inde a Campo." Heyne not. in 337. vii.

⁴ "Non satis definitum est quo sensu dictum sit *πρὸς αὐτὸν*, &c." Exc. i. in Lib. vii. See above.

⁵ See Trans. R. S. Edinb. iv. Dalzel's Illustr. of Chev.

encountered Dolon, who himself was beyond the reach of the Trojan outposts. The *τύμβος ἄκριτος* and *θρωσμός* cannot therefore have been the same.

The *θρωσμός*, whatever was meant by the word, lay between the wall and the Scamander: ¹ separated from the ships, but so near that sounds from this place were heard at the wall. At *Θ.* 490, it is said to be *Νόσφι νεῶν, ποταμῷ ἐπὶ δινίεντι, ἐν καθαρῷ*, and at *K.* 161. *ἐπὶ θρωσμῷ πεδίοιο, Εἵεται ἄγχι νεῶν, ὀλίγος δ' ἔτι χῶρος ἐρύκει*. The remark of Bryant and Rennell that 50,000 men were encamped *upon* this spot, may be answered by a reference to the use of the preposition *ἐπὶ* in the former quotation.² A second opinion of Prof. Heyne (*Not. in Il. Θ.* 490.) is that the *θρωσμός* was either a part of the plain more elevated (acclivior) than the rest, or is simply put for the plain. Rennell (53) considers it only as the ascent from the beach. It does not, however, appear possible that it can have been, as he expresses it, the first rising step, or ascent from, or even the summit of the beach of the sea, as the *τύμβος ἄκριτος* itself (according to the observations already made) was on the plain, and the Grecian rampart in near connexion with it. Now (as before remarked) the Trojans,

¹ How has Dr. Clarke contrived to displace his *Throsmos* so far from the situation assigned it by Homer? Its real Homeric site can never be questionable.

² Most of our difficulties in precise translation arise from the great ignorance under which we still lie with regard to the real meaning of the Greek prepositions. In this single discussion alone we have seen the apparently trifling words *ἐπὶ*, *ἐκ*, *πρὸς*, *παρ*, *περὶ* and *ἄμφω* occasion uncertainty in the minds of the greatest classical scholars of the age. In consequence of this ignorance we know nothing of the site of the Callicolone. Barnes translates *παρ' Σιμόεντι* *præter Simoenta*: others interpret it near or by. Rennell, from Dr. Gillies' translation of this passage, makes the Callicolone one of the eminences between the rivers. My *prejudice* is in favor of its being on the opposite bank of the Simois, as, why should Mars in his way from the Acropolis take the very circuitous mode of reaching the Callicolone of Rennell, by following the remote course of his Simois? His plan alone would be sufficient to render the supposition impossible. Heyne says, "*Collis ad Simoentem situs*" (*xx.* 53.) "*Amne quidem, quantum intelligitur, trajecto.*" (304.) There is no direct authority on the subject. It is singular that the Scholia, *K.* 160. and *τ.* 3. give a very different account of the *Throsmos*. In the former we find it was an elevated place in the plain before Troy, called by that name, as another similar place was called, Callicolone. At the latter passage it is said to be Callicolone itself, and the spot where Paris decided the difference between the three goddesses.

though near them, were certainly not encamped even in close communication with the Grecians. Dolon had some distance to pass before he met Diomed and Ulysses, who themselves had left behind them the Grecian outposts. In all this discussion it must not be forgotten that Dolon seems to have proceeded by a direct route from the tomb of Ilus, and that the line of Diomed and Ulysses was as direct from the centre of the Grecian camp. According to Rennell the *τύμβος ἄκριτος* was on the side of the station of Achilles, and attached to it was the right flank of the Grecian Rampart. (77.) His argument for such a position is, that "had it stood on the left, it would probably have been mentioned during the attack on the left by Hector." This view contains, however, much assumption, and probably some error. Many circumstances, which we know to have existed, are constantly omitted in Homer's narratives, and it will be a point of the hardest proof to show that Hector's attack was, as is asserted, on the Grecian left.

Homer does not say that the Trojan army of 50,000 men was drawn out in battle array *upon* the *αἰπεῖα κολώνη, σῆμα πολυσκάρθμοιο Μυρίνης* (B. 811.), but *ἐνθα*, there, or in its immediate neighbourhood, an arrangement, the facilities for which had been established by the previous description, *περίδρομος ἐνθα καὶ ἐνθα*.

The Tomb of Ilus was between Troy and the ford of the Scamander, therefore on a different side of the river from the Throsmos. It is remarkable that Whitaker should have fully admitted the correctness of Chevalier's position as to the identity of the Throsmos and tomb of Ilus. (Brit. Crit. ix. 600.) We know that the tomb of Ilus was in all probability as far from the Throsmos, as this was from the Grecian ships. At the tomb of Ilus Hector was removed from the noise of the army then encamped at the Throsmos, while even the tread of feet reached the Grecian walls from the latter position. Rennell, indeed, thinks it no proof of its distance from the Throsmos, that Hector retired to it in order to avoid the noise and tumult of the camp, as this might have been done by "merely ascending the mound." (85.) Surely the tumult occasioned by 50,000 men and horses could not have been so easily escaped. I regret also the necessity of differing from the same author as to the force of another supposed proof of the contiguity of the tomb of Ilus to the wall, drawn from the circumstance that Paris wounds the Grecian chiefs with arrows, (A. 370. 582.) from the tomb of Ilus in the battle near the Rampart (85. 33. &c.) There is no evidence that the battle was near the Rampart. Agamemnon was close to the Trojan wall, when

he returned wounded. It is said that the Trojans *would have pursued* them to the ships (311) had not Diomed arrested the flight of the Grecians. After receiving his wound from Paris, he orders his charioteer to drive to the ships. By the ships it is almost certain that the camp in general is understood, and it may be safely concluded, that, when the order was given, Diomed was not already in the immediate neighbourhood of the Rampart. Common sense seems to indicate a distance from the Rampart which would destroy the force of Rennell's argument. It is not at all clear where the contest was carried on, but Paris may have been in ambush even in the rear of the Grecian chiefs.

Neither is there any evidence that "the tomb of Ilus stood in the quarter opposite to the station of Ajax, *which is known to have been on the left*, or on the eastern part of the camp, where Hector made his attack." These important premises cannot be granted.

Dr. Vincent's unqualified concession to Chevalier of his tomb of Hector cannot be reconciled with consistency, or his well known learning. He had himself previously given up the supposed site of this tumulus in the rear of the city, but, in his last writing, not only revokes that correct opinion, but justifies also an evident misinterpretation of the passages upon which our judgments must be founded. On perusing the description (Ω. 798, &c.), it appears difficult to entertain a doubt as to the meaning of the poet, or to question whether the Tumulus were in the front or rear of Troy, or his grave covered with large or small stones. The people collected before the city (πρὸ ἄστεος) and during nine days were engaged in bringing wood. On the tenth day they carried out the body (ἐξέφερον) and burnt it on the Pyre. They collected the bones, and having placed them on a golden Λάρναξ, deposited them in a grave which they covered over with many large stones (not loosely.) They expeditiously constructed a Tumulus (σῆμα), guards being ranged all round (περὶ πάντη) lest they should be attacked by the Achæans. Having constructed the tumulus they returned (πάλιν κίον) and feasted in the palace of Priam.

Patroclus had previously requested (Ψ. 91.) that the same Σορός, χρύσεος ἀμφιφορεὺς, might contain his bones and those of Achilles, and this latter (Ψ. 245, &c.) constructed a moderate-sized tumulus to be enlarged after his death, when it might also contain his own ashes. This tumulus, containing the united ashes, and those of Antilochus in a separate urn, was afterwards constructed (μέγαν καὶ ἀμόμονα τύμβον) by the sacred army of Argives.

Ἄκτῃ ἐπὶ προῦχούσῃ, ἐπὶ πλατεί Ἑλλησπόντῳ·

Ὡς κεν τηλεφανὴς ἐκ ποντόφιν ἀνδράσιν εἴη

Τοῦς, οἳ νῦν γεγάασι, καὶ οἳ μετόπισθεν ἔσσονται. (Od. Ω. 82.)

The Flight of Hector. It is certainly true, as Chevalier, Dalzel, Bryant, Vincent, Heyne and others have determined, that independently of the equivocal interpretation of the two prepositions *περὶ* and *ἀμφὶ*, there is nothing in Homer's description which can warrant the hypothesis of the circular flight of Hector round the city of Troy. In addition to the arguments employed by these and other authors, to prove, from the general context, that the scene of action lay between the walls and the fountains of the Scamander, it may be remarked, that, when under apprehension for the safety of Hector, Andromache expresses her fears lest he should be pursued by Achilles, she simply says X. 456. *πεδίονδε δίηται*, without any allusion to a possible pursuit round the city. In order to satisfy herself on this point, she likewise immediately directs her steps to the tower, and wall, where the crowd was stationed, to view the combat. This stationary condition of the spectators is almost a sufficient evidence as to the meaning of Homer.

It appears that, in his flight, Hector had two objects in view: one to reach the gates; a second to bring Achilles within the scope of the darts from the towers. A circular flight close under the walls implies a contradiction to these intentions of the poet. If Hector had taken the lead in a circular flight, and Achilles (as is declared to have been the case) could not overtake him, why did not Hector reach the gates? It may be said, at least, that in traversing an oblique course of Hector, Achilles would place himself nearer the walls than his adversary, and thus have assisted one of his material objects.

It may be still further remarked, that although we do not necessarily conclude with Bryant and Dares Phrygius that Troy had seven gates, the Scæan gates were probably not the only gates of the city. These latter are particularised by Homer as leading into the plain. (Z. 392.) At B. 809. and Θ. 58. we learn that all the gates were opened. I am aware that, with a refinement and precision scarcely justifiable, Heyne denies the existence of any other than the Scæan gates on the ground that none other are mentioned by the poet, and for this reason seeks an explanation of *πᾶσαι* as a synonym of *Ὀλαι*. As the reason is insufficient and the distinction unnecessary, we may still conclude that the passage of the Trojan and allied armies was through more than one gate. Now if *πᾶσαι* allude to more than one gate, and Hector was pursued all round Troy, why was his only attempt at entrance made through the Dardanian gates? It matters

little whether the Scæan and Dardanian gates were or were not the same,¹ so long as the improbability remains that Homer should have precluded his Hero from the chance of escaping by more than one out of several means which offered themselves to his choice.

The particular argument for the circular flight of Hector round the walls of Troy is derived from the assumed interpretation of the prepositions *περὶ* and *ἀμφί*. That the first of these, in its Homeric application with an accusative case, has generally a meaning different from that which is included in the idea of an entire orbit, or in other words does not mean circularly round the object which it governs, will not admit a doubt. It is not easy to describe a circle round a river, or round a long wall, as in *τὰ περὶ καλὰ ῥέεθρα* and *περὶ τεῖχος*. The anonymous author in the Edinburgh Review has, however, established the possible fact of an entire circuit, as the test of the real meaning of *περὶ*, and as, according to this writer, Troy was situated in the midst of a level plain, was itself not on a hill, and from its site would, therefore, readily permit such a passage, he determines that Hector was pursued entirely round (*περὶ*) Troy. The argument is borrowed from Prof. Heyne, who, many years before, had said: "the expressions *περὶ* and *ἀμφί* imply only something indeterminate in regard to the place, provided other circumstances do not more accurately mark it out." From his own view of the topography of Troy, he assumed the converse of the position above stated. "As ancient Troy was accessible only on the side next the sea, and in the quarter of the Acropolis was surrounded by abrupt precipices, *περὶ* in this place could not have meant circularly round." In answer to both arguments, I will observe, that the conclusion is entirely gratuitous, and that the possibility of a circular passage does not necessarily connect that meaning with the preposition *περὶ*. The first of the six examples of its use in the narrative of Hector's flight seems alone sufficient to invalidate the whole hypothesis, from which the above-mentioned opposite conclusions are derived. There is no reason to suppose the goal or boundary described in the simile, X. 162. could not be entirely compassed, and yet *περὶ ἑρμα* means only half surrounded. That the *ἑρμα* in the chariot race had a passage round it is clear from the description (Ψ. 326.), as it was a dry pole with a

¹ See Schol. x. 6. It may be doubted whether *ποτὶ πτόλις* X. 198. generally translated *prope*, does not mean *erga*, an important difference; as *περὶ ἄστυ*, Σ. 266.

white stone on each side, and yet *περὶ τέρμα* occurs also at 466. when we know that a circular passage was not made round it.

Dr. Vincent decides, that "one instance is as good as a thousand," and that because *περὶ σῆμα*, occurring in various places, (as *Ω.* 16. 51. 416. 755.) meant all round, this interpretation should, therefore, be adopted in all other places. It has never been denied that *περὶ* has occasionally this meaning, but from what has already appeared it must be evident that no such unqualified conclusion can be warranted by any knowledge we are able to gain on this subject. From the general context of Homer we may further decide, that in his particular uses of the word, alone, or in composition, Homer never had in view an entire orbit or circle. At *Π.* 448. Jupiter says they are fighting *περὶ ἄστν*, when, if the poet's description may be trusted, we know they were not fighting round the city. In the passage *B.* 801, Iris (who had not like Juno occasion for equivocation,) says, the Grecians are about to fight *περὶ ἄστν*. As all the movements are accurately described, we may safely pronounce that, in this instance, *περὶ* did not mean all round the city. The whole contest in both these cases was confined to the space between the ships and the Scæan gates. So likewise in the passages *μαρνάμενοι περὶ ἄστν*, and *φθινύσουσι περὶ πτόλιν* (*Z.* 256. and 327.) we are informed that the battle took place between the Simois and Xanthus, (*Z.* 4.)¹ There is, however, one instance which may safely be considered as conclusive, against the orbicular interpretation of *περί*. It occurs *Odyssey* *Ξ.* 473., and alludes to the ambuscade of which Ulysses formed one party. It will not be contended that in the use of *περὶ ἄστν*, it was meant that three persons encompassed the city of Troy.

In all the examples of its application in connexion with Hector's flight, and even in the watch appointed by him (unless we admit this peculiar case to be an exception) we may adopt a more indeterminate and less extensive meaning. It is evident that Homer himself did not consider *περὶ* as sufficiently emphatical to bear, in itself, the interpretation of circularly round. The *περίδρομος ἔνθα καὶ ἔνθα*, whatever may be the meaning of the passage, shows the insufficiency of *περί*: whether *ἔνθα καὶ ἔνθα* (*B.* 811.) are required to make the *βατίεια* entirely open on all sides, or that these words annul the implied power of *περὶ*, by describing a passage open in certain parts only. The

¹ Pindar *Olymp.* xiii. 78, 79, says: τὰ δὲ καὶ ποτ', ἐν ἁλυσὶ πρὸ Δαρδάνου τε: χίτων ἰδύκταν, &c.

περὶ πάντη (Ω. 799.) seems to convey a meaning not necessarily included in *περὶ*, a remark which more decidedly applies to the *περὶ ἀμφὶ* (P. 760. X. 165, &c. Ψ. 191.) It is not quite clear that *περὶ* with a dative does not more uniformly mean all round, than with an accusative. In *περὶ σφισι* (Σ. 66.) Πατρόκλη, (P. 6. 137. 286. 355.) Χροῖ, (N. 25. 241. Ξ. 25.) δούρατι, (N. 77.) πόρτακι, (P. 4.) the notion is that of *all round*, and the same is true in numberless other places.

But the frequent use of *ἀμφὶ*, of which the meaning is precise, confirms, it is maintained, the hypothetical interpretation of *περὶ*. That *ἀμφὶ* is at least as indeterminate in its meaning as *περὶ* needs little illustration. In the examples *ἀμφὶ δέ τ' ἄκρας* (Δ. 425.) *ἀμφὶ νῆες* (Π. 276.) *πάντας* (N. 126.) *Ἀχελώϊον* (Ω. 616.) *ῥοὰς ποταμοῖο*, (Λ. 731.) *ῥέεθρα* (H. 135.) *κελεύθους* (N. 335.) *ἅλα* (Λ. 409.) *Σκάμανδρον* (H. 329.) *τεῖχος* (H. 449.) &c. this circular relation is wholly inadmissible. So also in *ἀμφὶ ἄστυ ἔρδομεν ἱρὰ θεοῖς* (Λ. 706.) *ἀμφὶ αὐτὸν Τρῶες ἔπονθ'* (Λ. 473.) *ἀμφὶς ἐοῦσα*, (H. 342.) this idea must be wholly excluded. With these and many other authorities it may be permitted us to question the supposed meaning of *ἀμφὶ πόλιν* I. 526. X. 381. Ω. 784. Φ. 442: and if at Ω. 789. Ψ. 256. *ἀμφὶ πυρὴν* be said to describe an entire orbit, we readily admit such an occasional meaning, but derive nothing in proof of its signification in the cases more immediately under examination.

Neither do we feel authorised to adopt the supposed meaning from a consideration of its uses in composition. Hector speaking of the actions of the Trojans says: *"Ἰλιον ἀμφεμάχοντο* (Z. 461.), which, even if it relate to the entire series of actions from the first arrival of the Grecians, supplies no definite evidence on the subject. Achilles in his account of these actions says he had destroyed twelve cities by sea, and eleven by land, *κατὰ* (not *περὶ* or *ἀμφὶ*) *Τροίην ἐρίβωλοι*, (I. 328.) and in the *Odyssey* (Λ. 498.) he gives an account of his deeds *ἐνὶ Τροίῃ εὐρείῃ*. We know from Homer's descriptions that in the tenth year no engagements took place round Troy, and Achilles, though he has elsewhere used the expression *"Ἰλιον ἀμφιμάχωμαι*, expressly declares his intention, even at the moment of his highest indignation, to do all possible mischief *"Ἰλιον προπάραιθεν*, not *περὶ* or *ἀμφὶ "Ἰλιον*, Φ. 104. When Hector is reproaching Paris for supineness, he says: the battle *ἄστυ ἀμφιδέδρε*, (Z. 329.) on your account, though we know its locality was in front of Troy.

Two or three instances occur in Homer, which prove that in composition *ἀμφὶ* did not describe an entire circle, and others may be found which indicate its application to two sides of a circle. At Η.

777. it is said of the sun μέσον οὐρανὸν ἀμφιβεβάσκει, a quarter of an entire circle. The same expression occurs Θ. 68. a line which Pope translates "Half the vault of Heaven." In ἀμφιέλισσαι (O. 549.) ἀμφοτέρωθεν, &c. only two sides are included. In ἀμφὶ as well as περὶ a sort of reduplication is in general necessary to describe a complete circumvolution as in πάντη δ' ἀμφί. (N. 806. Ψ. 34. 110, &c.)

I may conclude by remarking that the idea of circularly round is (as in the instance of περὶ) more frequently included in the connexion of ἀμφὶ with a dative, than with an accusative case, as we may see in ἀμφὶ ποσσὶ (N. 36.) ἀμφὶ αὐτῷ Π. 109. P. 359. ἀμφὶ Μενοιτιάδῃ, P. 267. &c. &c. &c.

From the sum of these arguments, I conclude, that a circular flight round the city of Troy was never in Homer's contemplation.¹

OBSERVATIONS

ON THE IAMBIC METRE OF PHÆDRUS.

I PROPOSE in this paper to consider some of the most prominent features in the Metre of Phædrus. To judge from the authority and example of many scholars, his professed imitators, it seems that little more has been thought necessary to the construction of his Iambic Metre, than to preserve a pure Iambic always in the last place. But Phædrus, however easy, and even negligent to a certain extent, in his versification, has still set certain bounds to the liberties, which he has taken in this respect. Indeed throughout his Prologues and Epilogues, he takes occasion to pride himself on the polish of his senarian lines,² and on the powerful influence of his numbers;³ and on this account, no less than on the merit of his invention, he builds his claim to the applause of

¹ Bryant has a very probable conjecture on the subject of κατ' ἀμαξιτόν as alluding to the place of that name in the Troad. It may be remarked that Pindar employs the same word under the interpretation commonly assigned to it in Homer: μακρὰ μοι νῆσθαι κατ' ἀμαξιτόν. Pyth. iv. 439. See Var. Lectt. in Il. ii. 791. 5. Heyne.

² Hanc ego polivi versibus senariis. Prol. L. 1.

³ Ut liber animus sentiat vim carminis. Prol. L. 8.

posterity, and anticipates with conscious satisfaction an immortality of fame. It may not therefore be amiss to examine somewhat minutely into the Metre of an author, who has confessedly paid so much attention to it.

In the first place I believe that Phædrus never allows himself to dispense with the observance of the middle cæsura. This with him is either penthemimeral, or hepthemimeral, at pleasure, so that every verse in Phædrus presents for its close after the cæsura, either *three* trochaics and a syllable, or *two* trochaics and a syllable, thus,

1 2 3
Quicunque turpi || fraude | semel in-|-notu-|-it. L. 1. F. 10.

or
Quicunque turpi fraude || semel in-|-notu-|-it.

The following verses are the only ones, which I have observed as offending this rule.

Primum esse ne tibi || videar molestior Epil. L. 3.
Forte occurrit | salutantis | dein invicem Lib. 3. F. 7.

The MSS. give the first line thus,

Primum, esse tibi ne videar molestior.

and Brotier and others have so printed it in their editions, upon the supposition, that the final *m* in *primum* need not be elided. But undoubtedly we ought to read, either with Bentley,

Primum esse videar || ne tibi molestior

or with Pithou

Primum tibi esse || ne videar molestior.

The next line exhibits a variety of readings in different editions, as may be seen in Schwabe's Phædrus. I shall here content myself with observing that the MSS. of Pithou and Rheims give *dein* salutantis invicem, and that of Perottus deinde *salutati* invicem, and that the line therefore may be corrected in the following manner, upon the faith of these several Manuscripts,

Forte occucurrit. || dein salutati invicem

I have reserved for a separate consideration the case of what Porson calls in his preface to Hecuba, the Quasi-cæsura, that is, of a cæsura interrupted, or at least weakened, by an elision. Of this sort I have met with the examples following,

- | | |
|---|--------------|
| 1. Formoso se Pavonum immiscuit gregi | L. 1. F. 3. |
| 2. Novissimè prolapsam effundit sarcinam | L. 3. F. 15. |
| 3. Cum destinassem operis habere terminum | Prol. L. 4. |
| 4. Complexus est quem Athenienses spreverant | L. 5. F. 1. |
| 5. Ipso ludorum ostenderet sese die | L. 5. F. 7. |

I will consider them, each in their order. In the first line the MSS. read, *Immiscuit se formoso pavontum gregi*: but the prose

versions of Romulus, Vincentius, and Anonymus Nilantii, *all* give miscuit se, and from these the line, therefore, may be thus corrected,

Se miscuit pavonum || formoso gregi.

The second line requires nothing but the substitution of fundit for effundit.

The third line is thus printed in Schwabe's edition,

Cum destinassem || terminum operi statuere,

and this I prefer, as being close to the reading of the Manuscripts, which have terminum operis *habere*. This last word in the MSS. has evidently been added by some person more solicitous about the sense, than the metre. I will here hazard a conjecture, which may throw some light on the four first lines of the Prologue to the fourth Book. It is observable, that the last word of the first line of the MSS., namely *habere*, is certainly spurious, and that the last word both of the third and fourth lines of this Prologue is entirely wanting in the Manuscript copies. It is probable, therefore, that, in some ancient copy, the parent of the few Manuscripts hitherto discovered, the corner of the first leaf of this book had been torn or damaged; and that thence has arisen the blank, which we now experience. This conjecture is confirmed by the circumstance, that the second line, being shorter than the rest, has escaped unhurt, and is quite perfect in all the Manuscripts. If there be any truth in this conjecture, such emendations are entitled to the best reception, which least disturb the order of the words preserved in the Manuscripts, and merely supply a termination. For this reason as the fourth line in all the Manuscripts stands thus,

Nam si quis talis etiam est tituli . . .

perfect in its rhythm as far as it goes, and wanting nothing but some word at the end, I should esteem the simple addition of some such word as *diligens* to the line, as preferable to the emendation of Bentley,

Nam si quis talis etiam tituli est æmulus,

which, however good both for sense and metre, does a little unnecessary violence to the order of the words in the Manuscripts, by the transposition of *est*.

To return to my subject, with respect to the fourth line, it is a mere invention of Ursinus, and is therefore properly rejected by many editors.

The fifth line may be corrected by a mere transposition of words. Some persons might recommend the words to be thus read,

Ostendērēt īpso || sese ludorum die,

but I shall endeavour to show presently, that this would be only the substitution of one metrical error for another, and I would recommend to place the words thus,

Ipso die ludorum || sese ostenderet,

or perhaps still better,

Ipso ludorum || sese ostenderet die.

Let no one wonder that the words in this line should have been altered from their original position to make *ostenderet* the middle word of the line, for among the Greek writers of the lower ages, and even among the more modern imitators of Iambics, to have a dipodia of this sort in the middle, consisting of an entire word, is considered as the triumph of their art. Thus Faernus, in his imitation of the 17th Fable of the third Book of Phædrus, expands the *Pinus Cybebæ* of the latter, or as he read it, *Pinus Neptuno*, into the following, in his opinion no doubt, most sonorous line,

Pinum humidi | tridentifer | Rector sali. Schwabe's Phæd. v. 2. p. vi.

The inquisitive may see a very short treatise *De Versibus Comicis* by Faernus himself, in which he commends the union of the two middle feet in one quadri-syllable. It is republished by Reizius, at the end of his Edition of the *Rudens Plauti*, and well merits to be read. Hence it is, that the *esse in tutelâ suâ* of Phædrus is transposed into *esse tutelâ in suâ*. Indeed I have no doubt, that the whole design of Faernus in reconstructing this fable was to outshine Phædrus, and to improve his versification. With this view he constantly puts a pure Iamb, or Tribrach, in the even places. As the Fable is not long, I will transcribe it here, and the reader, who will take the trouble to compare this with the genuine text of Phædrus, will instantly be convinced, how much of the spirit of the original has evaporated in the transfusion.

*Legere proprias Dii sibi quondam arbores,
Quam quisque vellet esse tutelâ in suâ,
Quercum supremus Jupiter, Myrtum Venus,
Pinum humidi Tridentifer Rector sali,
Apollo Laurum, Populum excelsam Hercules.
Mirata enim vero est | Minerva, cur ita
Infructuosas legere voluissent, quibus
Tantum ad manum esset fructuosarum arborum.
Cui Jupiter causam hanc | roganti reddidit,
Ne existimemur fructu honorem vendere.
Tum Pallas: at vos facite, quod vobis lubet,
Ego, inquit, oleam fructuum causâ lego.
Exosculatus filiam tum Jupiter,
O Nata, dixit, jure sapiens omnibus
Dicere sæclis; jure tu capitis mei
Propago; nam quod facimus, id nisi utile est,
Stulta omnis atque inanis inde est gloria.*

How much pains have been here bestowed to produce a bad copy of an excellent original ! The *last* line of Phædrus

Nisi utile est, quod facimus, stulta est gloria,

is indeed a golden one ; but in the hands of Faernus, it is like gold under the beater's hand, which is rendered less valuable by every stroke that it receives, and becomes impoverished in proportion as it is expanded. I call this emphatically the last line, for who does not perceive, that to say any thing after it, is to spoil its effect ? In particular the miserable line, which " like a wounded snake drags its slow length along,"

Nihil agere quod non prosit, Fabella admonet,

is not in Perottus, is not wanted, is a perfect excrescence.

A second Rule, which Phædrus seems to have observed is, whenever he resolves one long into two short quantities, to comprise the two short syllables together in one word, or part of a word, and not to let them be divided between two words, except in the case of monosyllables.

Thus for example, to take an instance that occurs in the 1st Prologue ; in the verse,

Calumniari si quis autem völäerit

the 5th foot is a dactyl, and the two short syllables representing the long syllable of an Iamb, are regularly found in one word, or rather part of a word, together.

The only deviations from this rule, of which I am aware, are the following,

- | | |
|--|--------------|
| 1. Non rem expedire, sed mälä videre expetit. | L. 1. F. 16. |
| 2. Qui paucas ostëndit, ěgo plures dissero | Prol. L. 4. |
| 3. Căpüt ĩta ad nostrum furor illorum pertinet | L. 1. F. 30. |
| 4. Ąsopüs ĩbĭ stans naris emunctę senex | L. 3. F. 4. |

With respect to the first line it is one of the most disputed in all Phædrus, as may be seen by a reference to Schwabe's edition. Burman and others cure the fault by reading

Non rem expedire, sed malum dare expetit.

For my own part I believe the whole of this Promythium to be a later interpolation, and if not impertinent, at least unnecessary. The Fable itself supplies excellently its own moral in these two words, Lupo sponsore. I suspect, that the first interpolation consisted only of one line, and that it was written thus in the Manuscript,

Fraudator hominē āvocat sponsū improbū

the final *m* being expressed only by a line, and āvocat standing for advocat. Romulus (Schwabe's Phædr. v. 2. p. 622.) translates it into prose in this manner, Fraudatores, cum mutantur, fidedictores

dant improbos. Not a word more is said by Romulus in relation to the second line. The first line, as above given, and unconnected with any other, is good sense, and according to the usage of the middle ages good metre, and I may say too, good metre even at this day in the opinion of those, who think that the final *m* in *hominem* need not be elided before *advocat*. In process of time *cum* was inserted between *hominem* and *advocat*, *hominē* became *nomen*, *sponsū* became *sponso*, *āvocat* became *avocat* and *vocat*, and another line was added in the hope of throwing light upon the subject, but which in effect only made it darker. We are indebted to modern commentators and editors for the inoffensive form which these lines are now made to assume in the text of Schwabe's *Phædrus*.

With respect to the second line, Bentley gives correctly as to metre,

Quia paucas ille ostendit ēgō plures fero,

but in this, as in the former example, there is the greatest disagreement, both among Manuscripts and Editions. It appears to me on this account extremely suspicious, and still more so on its own account, as being a useless incumbrance to the sentence, and little more than an amplification of the line that follows,

Usus vetusto genere, sed rebus novis.

With respect to the 3rd example, Bentley has properly restored it to just metre by reading

*Ită căpūt ad nostrum furor illorūm pertinet.

In the same manner, in the following verse

*Alīi ōnērānt saxis, quidam contra miseriti L. 3. F. 2.

the first foot is a proceleusmaticus, for to consider *alīi* here as a dissyllable, which some critics recommend, appears a forced measure, and is introducing at least an unnecessary licence.

I now come to the last example, and here too neither MSS. nor printed copies agree. The MS. of Perottus exhibits this line and the succeeding one, in the form of mere syllabic Iambics, agreeable to the corrupt practice of the middle ages, without any regard either to cæsura, or to quantity,

Æsopus ibi stans || narrare incipit

Naturam nequaquam || verba cuiquam dare.

It may be corrected either by reading with Bentley, *Æsopūs ibī tum n. e. s.*, or with Heinsius, *Æsopūs āstans n. e. s.*

I have said, that Monosyllables are exempt from this rule, as

Ante hos sex mensēs, māle, āit, dixisti mihi.

L. 1. F. 1.

Calumniatōr āb ōve cum peteret canis,

L. 1. F. 17.

In these instances the short intervening monosyllable is to coalesce with the *succeeding* word so as to make in the first instance a dac-

tyl, and in the second an Iamb resolved into a Tribrach. Whether the short intervening monosyllable may coalesce with the *preceding* word, so as to make an Anapest, may admit of some doubt, as examples of this sort are very rare, while examples of the other sort are common enough. I know only one instance,

Trivio conceptūs ēt ēducatus stercore,

L. 1. F. 27.

and here Bentley omits the *et*. In another instance the monosyllable is not an intervening syllable, but the first syllable of an Anapest, as

Nēc ōpīnans et sinistram fregit tibiam

L. 5. F. 7.

The first words of this line however, it must be remembered, do not rest on the authority of any Manuscript, being merely conjectural.

Euripides in his Cyclops affords two instances of a monosyllable prefixed to an Iamb, and thus making an Anapest, namely,

Συνεκθανεῖν δὲ σῖγῶντα χρὴ τῷ πάματι 568.

Μέμφει τὸν ἑρᾶσθην, καὶν τρυφαῖς πεπωκότα 584.

Many editions, instead of *σιγῶντα* read *σπῶντα*, and in the second line Heath proposes to read *μέμφει γ' ἑρᾶσθην*, unnecessarily, as the article here may be considered as uniting itself to the substantive, and as forming together with it but one word.

The reason for this second rule of Phædrus seems, I think, obvious enough—for when a Tribrach is put for an Iamb, it still ought to be considered as an Iamb, and not to enter the verse in the character, or in the resemblance even of a Trochee. Thus in the line above mentioned

Non rem expedire, sed mālā vīdere expetit

the division of the Tribrach here favours more strongly the Rhythm of a Trochaic, than an Iambic foot. In the following line

Æsopus ibi stans naris emunctæ senex,

after the short syllable in *Æsopus*, one long syllable, or two short syllables, are all that is wanting to complete the foot; but if instead of what is required a word follows, which is of itself an entire Iamb, it is evident that the final syllable of *Æsopus* becomes then a superfluous and redundant quantity. Again in the verse

Qui paucas ostēdit, ēgo plures dissero,

at the end of the word *ostēdit* the ear perceives a perfect Trochee. These different effects are not produced, when the trisyllabic feet, instead of being inartificially broken between two words, are contained in the body of an entire word, as

Audierat esse quod rēmedium vulneris

L. 2. F. 3.

Clitellas impōsitūrum victorem putas

L. 1. F. 15.

Τῷς τ' ἄρ' αὖς ἐξέφθορῶντο. δῆσαντες δέ σε

Cyclops 235.

Calvus comosâ fronte, nudo occipitio

L. 5. F. 8.

The same effects may likewise be avoided by an artificial division of the trisyllabic feet between two words, so as to keep and tie together in one word the two short syllables into which the long has been resolved, as

Respondit illē : Fācēres si causā meā	L. 1. F. 22.
Qui postquā cāde fessus est, āsinum ēvocat	Ib. F. 11.
Noli imputare vanū bēnēficiū mihi	Ib. F. 22.

It will be found, that Euripides in his Satyric Iambics has conformed his versification to this rule, and in the line therefore

Πῦρ καὶ πατρῶον τόνδε λέβητά γ' ὅς ζέσας, Cyclops, 343.

recognised by Gaisford in his excellent edition of Hephæstion, p. 242, and confirmed by the MSS., I think nevertheless, that τόν, instead of τόνδε as proposed by Barnes, and adopted by Hoepfner, is the more correct reading.

A third rule which Phædrus has observed is, not only to keep the resolved syllables together in one word, but to place them always at the *beginning* of a word, as

Ne gloriari libeāt ālienī bonis	L. 1. F. 3.
Omne insuētīs ōnīs et cæpissent queri	Ib. F. 2.
Nōn quā crudelis ille, sed quōniām grave	Ib.

The only deviation from this rule, which occurs in Phædrus, as far as I have observed, is in the line following

E populo sic nēsciō quis, ut fieri solet	L. 3. F. 9.
--	-------------

But nescio quis here is no more than aliquis, and like quilibet may be considered as one word. The same word occurs again indeed

Ita ut putavīt īs ēsse nesciō quīd boni	L. 2. F. 5.
---	-------------

but to my mind this line is undoubtedly an interpolation, and a mere explanation of the preceding line,

Agnoscit hominem Cæsar, remque intelligit,

that is, "Cæsar takes notice of the man, and comprehends his object; namely, that he (the man) thought to get something for his trouble." The line, when properly understood, is unnecessary; but Commentators have made it worse by their misinterpretation. Schwabe, to favour his interpretation of it, reads

Id ut putavit esse nesciō quīd boni;

Whoever strikes it out of the text entirely will purge Phædrus of so much dross. We may now decide, that the line

Quasi paucas ostēdērīt, ego plures dissero, Schw. v. 2. p. 439.

proposed, as an emendation, by Brotier, is wholly inadmissible.

On the same account this line, which appears in some books,

Cum destinassem opēris habere terminum,	Prol. L. 4.
---	-------------

has as little pretensions to authenticity. The line mentioned in the preceding part of this essay,

Ostendērēt īpso sese ludorūm die,

is liable to a similar objection. When the two short syllables are not strictly *final*, but become so only by the means of elision, they do not fall within the operation of this rule, as

Auxilia dum requirit exitūm īvenit	L. 2. F. 31.
Alvos āccipite et ceris opus infundite	L. 3. F. 13.
Qui sæpe laqueos et mūscipula effugerat	L. 4. F. 2.
Suis ligārant, ut cōspicūm in prœlio,	L. 4. F. 6.
Exigua cum frenaret matēria impetum	L. 4. F. 26.

In these, and other instances that might be advanced, the two short syllables seem to be considered as being in the middle of the word, notwithstanding the elision of the final syllable.

The reason of this rule is not, to me at least, so obvious as that of the preceding. Why is it, that Phædrus continually concludes his Iambics with words like *pētērīnt*, but never concludes a verse in this manner, *commōdā fidēs*? Why is it that Phædrus never begins a verse in this manner, *Nunc auspiciā sunt*, while he frequently introduces a tribrach in the same place after another form, as *Cogitque misēras*? It may be observed that the cæsura is the soul of Iambic verse, as it is also of the heroic, and that in the condemned forms abovementioned the cæsura is not only destroyed, but the foot is made to terminate on two short syllables instead of one long, and thus by this licence the ear perceives still more forcibly the absence of the cæsura. Nothing is more common, even among the Tragedians, than to place a *spondee* without cæsura in the 5th place, as

Πατήρ, ἦν, εἴ ποτ' Ἰλίου τείχεῖ πέσοι, Hecuba, v. 11.

but read here *τείχεῖ* instead of *τείχεῖ*, and, though the rhythm or numerical quantity is precisely the same, the metre is destroyed. But whatever may be the reason of this rule, Phædrus seems to have observed it more religiously than Euripides in his Satyric Iambics. There are several verses in the Cyclops, where a tribrach enters, as an entire word, without any cæsura, as

Ἀνέχε. πᾶρθε. τί τάδε; τίς ἡ ῥαθυμία;	v. 203.
Ὡς τ' εἰς ἄκρους γε τοὺς ὀνυχᾶς ἀΐκετο,	v. 158.
Χῶρει δ' ἐς οἴκους πρὶν τι τὸν πᾶτ' ἔρ' παθεῖν,	v. 297.

I believe there is no instance in the Cyclops of a similar tribrach in the *third* place, and there no doubt the absence of the regular cæsura would be much aggravated by such an additional licence. But the Commentators and Editors of Phædrus have not scrupled, as has been before mentioned, to make him the father of such a monster in ascribing to him this line,

Cum destinassem ὀπέρῃς habere terminum.

Herman has produced an instance of a dactyl in the third place, unconnected by any cæsura, in the line following,

Κιβάρα, τρίποδες, ἄρμαῖτ᾽, τράπεζαι χάλκεαι.

Elementa Doctrinæ Metricæ, p. 139. Ed. 1816.

On the subject of this rule, in relation to the fifth place, there are some very judicious observations of Seidler, annexed to his treatise on Dochmiacs, p. 380.

The deviations from the three preceding rules in Burman's Appendix, republished in Schwabe's Edition of Phædrus, are very frequent; and it may serve perhaps the purpose of further illustration to set down a few examples of these deviations under distinct heads.

Offences against the first rule.

Quo mures diffugiunt strepitu perterriti	F. 9.
Et frustra largiter jactari a familia	F. 10.
Jejunis projici jubetur bestiis	F. 15.
Et gaudens de alieno saturavit æmulum	F. 20.
Inimicum si tradidero hodie gregis tui,	F. 20.
Fortunam mutari suam blandè petit	F. 33.

Offences against the second rule.

Decepta vulpis quid opūs ērāt loqui mihi	F. 13.
Meo ne tegminē videaris pulchrior	F. 22.
Properasti tale ne mihī vēniret mali	F. 11.
Cui Miluūs ēgo ut pervenirem nuptias	F. 34.
Et a pastore visus quā pārtē fūgeret	F. 23.
Te imposito, me gravari sentirē pōtui	F. 31.

Offences against the third rule.

Cæpit securi magna excidērē robora	F. 5.
* Me teneo quin te salvīs calcibūs ēxteram	F. 17.
At illa quamvis excidērēt animus tamen	F. 19.
* Et protinūs auxilium petens anser simul	F. 26.
* Fugiente devōrāt ānserem ciconia	Ib.
Hæcne est polliciti āquilā dixit fides tui	F. 34.

The last, and the last line but two, have no middle cæsura, and the last line but one is embellished with a very awkward one, if indeed it deserve the name. But the prince of verses both for a false cæsura, and for a false division of the vice-iambic tribrach, is the following,

Enectos a leonībūs hōmines ait	F. 25.
----------------------------------	--------

Although Euripides has many verses, that make a tribrach of an entire word, without any cæsura, as we have seen above, yet, I believe, he affords no instance of a cæsura falling upon two short

syllables, instead of one long syllable, as in the line last cited, and in the several preceding lines, marked with an asterisk.

We may perceive from the errors of Burman and others, how necessary it is to ascertain the laws of metre adopted by an author, before we attempt to make any conjectural emendations, or even to make a choice among different readings in Manuscripts. Until this preliminary point be fixed, criticism has no certain object, and all endeavours at correction of the text are little better than shooting arrows into the air. Nor is the pleasure arising from an accurate knowledge of metre inferior to its utility; for whoever has a thorough insight into this matter, may be considered as having a key to the secret mechanism of the Composer, and is precisely in that condition, in which Phædrus, in common with every other poet, wishes his readers to be,

Ut liber animus sentiat vim carminis.

I will now apply the preceding rules, as a sort of touchstone, to the New Fables of Phædrus, said to be discovered in the Codex Perottinus, and published at Naples 1811, first by Cassittus, and afterwards by Cataldus Jannelius.* I must first premise, that I have never seen the Neapolitan Editions, and that all my knowledge of the New Fables is derived from a neat and useful edition of Phædrus, published at Paris 1812.

To begin with the matter of Cæsura, I find only one defective line in this respect.

Paulò post armillam | tollit is argenteam

F. 17.

This defect might be removed by reading

Armillam paulo post tollit is argenteam

but still there remains an objection to the division of the two short syllables in the dactyl tollit is, as is is here not an intervening monosyllable, but a final one, and is totally different therefore from the following division of the two short syllables, which is very common in Phædrus, and where the monosyllable does not conclude the foot, but is involved in the middle of it,

Tum circumeunti fuerat quòd iter longius.

F. 19.

Whoever may be its author, the whole of this seventeenth Fable is contemptible stuff, and beneath criticism.

The following examples occur of a wrong division of the two short syllables, put for one long syllable,

Hæc qui negavit, magno consilio, homini

F. 3.

Respondit contra: tu bene quidem prædicas

F. 32.

Licet horreum mihi pateat ego scalpam tamen

F. 11.

* They are reprinted in the *Classical Journal*, Nos. XXVIII. and XXIX.

The first line might be restored to metre in this manner,

Hæc qui negavit homini, consilio gravi.

The second line might be cured by reading *equidem* for *quidem*, but in truth this Fable is a fit companion for the 17th. The last line of it,

Quin sequeris prædam? Etiam tibi | committo meam,

exhibits an hepthemimeral cæsura after two short syllables, such as is inadmissible, and without example in Phædrus. The third and last line I would amend by transposition, thus

Licet mi pateat horreum, scâlpam egö tamen,

An intervening monosyllable occurs in an anapæstic foot in the following line,

Effusa trepidos pulsât, et omnes dissipat F. 16.

The introduction of the monosyllable in this case, as the metre is complete without it, has a cloying and disagreeable effect; but whether it may be retained, or ought to be rejected, in imitation of Bentley's correction of the line already mentioned,

Trivio conceptus, educatus stercore,

I shall leave others to determine.

The following examples occur of a wrong combination of short syllables :

- | | |
|---|--------|
| 1. Novem porrectus Titýs est per jugera, | F. 7. |
| 2. Voces resolvit acta Pythiâ numine, | F. 8. |
| 3. Quos ultra paulo villa splendidâ Divitis | F. 16. |
| 4. Lacrymis obortis, vivit felices, ait, | F. 21. |
| 5. Multi infideles pectörë, verbis benevoli | F. 27. |

The first line may be corrected by the omission of *est*, and by the conversion of *suggerens* in the next line of the context to *suggerit*,

The second line needs only transposition, and we may read

Voces resolvit Pythia acta numine.

In the third line read

Quos splendida ultra paulò villa divitis.

In the fourth line I would omit *ait*, and read

Lacrymis obortis, vos felices vivite ;

ait, inquit, etc. are frequently omitted by Phædrus, and have been frequently inserted by the copyists.

In the last verse the antithesis between *pectore* and *verbis* seems puerile, for what other infidelity can there be but that of the breast? I should prefer a more simple enunciation of the moral in this manner,

Multi infideles sunt verbis benevoli.

I will now notice some false quantities, that exist in the edition which I have of the New Fables. An ingenious and learned writer, in a former Number of the Classical Journal,¹ has very justly questioned the quantity of *repulit* in the following verse,

Jucunditatis causam non rēpūlīt Venus.

F. 11.

Repulit, I believe, in the most approved authors, and certainly *retulit*, *retudit*, and *reperit* in the perfect tense, in Phædrus are found with the first syllable long.—The reason of this perhaps is, that the first syllable is a contraction of two short syllables, that is to say, that *rēpulit* is quasi *rēpēpulit*, in the same manner as *mōmentum* is quasi *mōvīmentum*, *suspicio* quasi *suspīcītio*, *hūmanus* quasi *hōmīnanus*, and *hībērnus* quasi *hībēmernus*. I believe, that in all other words, and in the words abovementioned in all tenses but the perfect, and those derived from the perfect, the first syllable is made short by Phædrus, except in the single instance,

Delusa ne spes ad querelam recidat.

L. 3. F. 13.

But it is observable, that the sense of this line is not in *Romulus*, and that the whole *Epimythium* may well be spared as an idle repetition and expansion of the last line of the Fable,

Omnesque propriis sunt contentæ dotibus.

In the line,

Ut quisquis essēt pār officium reciperet,

F. 23.

par is made long, but if we transpose the words into *officium par*, all is right.

In these two lines,

Male cēssit, ait, artis quā sum nescius

F. 14.

Hæc quōtīdīānā capta consuetudine.

F. 15.

the last syllable in *quā* must be long, and the second syllable in *quōtīdīānā* short; but if in the first line we substitute *inquit* for *ait*, and in the last we omit *hæc*, the metre will be rendered perfect;² the second line may even remain as it is, if we consider *quōtīdīānā* as a quadrisyllable. In Fable thirty-two the final syllable in *rogo* is made short, with what propriety let those determine who think this Fable genuine.

Having noticed some defects in the metre of the New Fables, I will now mention some things, which to their credit I do not find in them, and the absence of which from the New Fables, if the authenticity of these can be established, may go some way to prove that they ought not to be found in the Old Fables.

¹ No. XXVI. p. 367.

² *Classical Journal*, *ibid*.

In the former there is no example of *m* final not elided, of the termination of the passive infinitive in *ier*, or of the penultima of the perfect in *erunt* made short. In the Old Fables two instances are met with of the passive infinitive in *ier*.

Et incipiebat Princeps *ingrēdiēr*, eum.

L. 5: F. 7.

Mirati sibi legatos non *revertier*.

L. 4. F. 17.

The former however is printed in some books, on the faith, I believe, of Manuscripts, in this manner,

Et incipiebat ingredi princeps, eum.

It may be observed too, that *ingrēdiēr* terminating in two short syllables offends against the third rule above-mentioned. There remains therefore but a solitary instance, and this occurs in a Fable so destitute both of wit and decency, that every lover of Phædrus must be disposed to distrust its authenticity. I am happy to think, that this extraordinary form of the infinitive does not furnish the only ground for the rejection of this Fable, but that it contains also another solitary instance, equally suspicious, of the final syllable made short in the first person of the present tense of the first conjugation, namely,

Nōn vētō dimitti, verum cruciari fame.

In the Old Fables the following instances occur of the *e* made short in *erunt*, the third person plural of the perfect tense.

1. Illis revertor hostis qui me læsērunt.

L. 3. F. 2.

2. Hirci mœrentes indignari cœpērunt.

L. 4. F. 15.

3. Felique et catulis largam præbuērunt dapem.

L. 2. F. 4.

4. Abiturus illuc quo priores abiērunt.

L. 4. F. 19.

In the two former instances the MSS. and several editions give *læserant*, and *cæperant*. In the third line, the MSS. have

Felisque catulis largam præbuerunt dapem,

but, I think, whoever reads the Fable, will agree with me, that this line is altogether an interpolation, inserted merely to complete, as was supposed, the catastrophe. The fourth line is, to my mind, still more clearly an interpolation. It stands at the head of eleven lines, containing an apostrophe to a miser, and by no means destitute of vigor, either in conception, or expression; but they have nothing of the manner of Phædrus; they are by far too much laboured for him, every line containing an antithetical sentence, and exhibiting a perfect rhetorical climax.

I will just add, before I conclude, that in the New Fables an anapæst after a dactyl occurs once,

Quum venatorem celerī pedē fūgērēt lepus.

F. 28.

but this fault may be cured by transposition, thus

Quum fugeret venatorem celeri pede lepus;

Phædrus has admitted twice or thrice *apparently* an anapæst after a dactyl, but it is in appearance only, and in the case of the word *beneficium*, which ought to be considered as a quadrisyllable, in the same way as he makes *inediâ* a trissyllable in the following verse,

Quid multa? *Inediâ* sunt consumti cum suis. L. 2. F. 4.

and as *consilium* and *principium* in the Odes of Horace, and as *ariete* in heroic verse are *all* used as trissyllables.

To the question, whether I believe the newly discovered Fables to be genuine, my answer is, that, to judge from internal evidence alone, their authenticity rests upon as good a foundation, as that of the Old Fables. They have both, no doubt, been mutilated and disfigured in their passage to us, sometimes from the negligence of transcribers, who were so inattentive to metre as to make their copies without any distinction of the text into verses, and more often from the vanity of the learned, who have decked the simplicity of the original with their own tinsel. I believe, likewise, that some entire Fables are spurious, and it is to the interest of Phædrus that they should be thought so.

Paris, June 1, 1817.

J. M.

ΠΕΡΙ ΤΟΥ ΦΟΙΝΙΚΟΣ.

Part III.—[Continued from No. XXIX. p. 14.]

I SHALL perhaps be accused of having been too rash, in speaking of Al Choder and of Aphridun, as of imaginary persons, one of whom was symbolized by the palm-tree, and the other by the Phoenix. Al Choder, or Kheder, and Aphridun, or Phridun, or Feridun, it may be said, were both real historical personages. The first was a General in the army of Iskender Dhoul-Carnaïn; and the second was a King of Persia, the sixth of the Pischdadian dynasty.

This account sounds very well; but it does not quite accord with some others, which are nevertheless made to accompany it by various Oriental writers. What are we really to believe of Choder, or Kheder, who, according to the Tarikh Montekhed, was

the nephew of Abraham, while Beidavi asserts that he flourished in the time of Aphridun, or Feridun, whom Ben Shohnah holds to be the same with Dhoul-Carnaïn, who is said in the Tarikh Montekhed to have been Alexander the Great? Beidavi, as he is cited by Hottinger, affirms in defiance of history, chronology, and common sense, that Alchoder, who was Elijah, existed in the time of Moses. If we turn to D'Herbelot, we shall find, that the Orientalists held Al Choder, or Kheder, to have been immortal, because he had drunk of the water, and had eaten of the fruit of the tree of life. Mr. Richardson, no doubt from Oriental authorities, tells us that Kheder, or Khizr, as he more properly writes the name, was a Prophet, and a Vizir, or General, of an ancient Persian King, called Alexander Caicobad, not Alexander of Macedon. Indeed D'Herbelot has remarked that there were two Iskenders, each of whom had the surname of Dhoul-Carnaïn. But is it not rather singular that the first of these, an ancient Persian King, the first of the Caianian Dynasty, should have borne a Greek name? Then how came he to be called Dhoul-Carnaïn, i. e. *Bicornis*? That Alexander the Great should have received this appellation, will not appear extraordinary to those, who have seen the medals which represent the pretended son of Ammon, or who remember the story recorded by Aulus Gellius. But what could Caicobad have to do with such a name? Some Oriental writers say that he was so called, because he had conquered both the East and the West. The reason is not very satisfactory. But the most surprising part of the history is yet to come. D'Herbelot tells us that Dhoul-Carnaïn was no other than Choder, or Kheder; while Mr. Richardson informs us, that the Orientalists confound this same Kheder with St. George of England.

Let us begin the history of Aphridun, or Phridun, or Feridun, by stating from the Shah Nameh of Ferdousi, that this celebrated King of Persia was nursed by a cow. He was elevated to the throne by the military skill and unparalleled valor of a blacksmith, whose apron afterwards became the banner of the Persian Monarchs. Feridun is said to have been a very wise and valiant Prince, who performed many wonderful exploits, and who upon one occasion changed himself into a dragon to frighten his children. According to the Rooret El Sefa of Mirkhond, this Prince

conquered the whole world, and divided it among his three sons. His reign is stated to have lasted 500 years. To this authentic history, I shall only add, that the author of the Terach Cozidez affirms that Feridun was an excellent Mussulman.

I shall now, I trust, be permitted to call Al Choder and Aphridun imaginary persons. It remains to be enquired, why I have traced their names to the Arabic rather than to the Persian. The fables, that identify Al Choder and Aphridun with Henoch, and Elijah, seem to be all of Arabian manufacture; and the Arabians, like the Greeks, were ever desirous of tracing foreign names to their own language. According to D'Hérbelot, the Orientalists gave his name to Choder, or Kheder, or Khizr, "à cause qu'il jouit d'une vie florissante et immortelle." My knowledge of Persian is too limited to allow me to pronounce positively that *خضر* *Khizr* is not an original word in that language, signifying *green*, *flourishing*; but there can be no doubt that there is such a word with such a meaning in Arabic, and that *Khizir* signifies *palma virescens*. If Phridun, or Feridun, be originally Persian, this name may be *فریدان* *gloria, vel decus potestatis*. But still this does not correspond with the tales, which make Aphridun, the same with Al Choder, and with Henoch and Elijah. Undoubtedly the Arabic *Khizir*, *viridis*, or *palma virescens*, and Phridun, *ille qui singularis et unicus fuit, ut etiam phoenix sæculi sui*, were names better adapted to that immortal being, who, according to the Jews and Arabians, has appeared at different periods under the names of Henoch, Phinehas, and Elijah, than any other appellation, which, as far as I know, can be obtained from any similar combination of letters in the Persian language.

I shall now proceed to consider the traces, which may yet be found in the East of the fable of the Phoenix.

There are three names under which the Chinese appear to recognise the ideal existence of this celebrated bird. The first is the *Yatana*, which is said to live for a thousand years. The second is named the *Louan*, and is described as the most beautiful of birds. The name indeed is said to express "that which shines with every colour;" and the song of the *Louan* is said to be more melodious than that of the nightingale. It will be remembered, that the voice of the Phoenix has been extolled in the verses of

Claudian and Lactantius. The third is called *Foung*, or *Foung-hoang*; and is represented as the king of the birds, by which he is surrounded in great numbers, (*innumera comitantur aves*) as often as he makes his appearance. The Chinese confess, however, that this bird has been rather a stranger among them, and has only shown himself during the reigns of their most virtuous Emperors. There is yet one remark which I have to make, and which may merit the consideration of the antiquary. The Chinese make graphic representations of the *Foung*, as the Egyptians appear to have done of the Phoenix.

Every reader of the Arabian Nights' Entertainments has heard of the celebrated bird, which the inhabitants of Yemen call the *roch*, or *roc*. (رخ) But this bird, which lays an egg larger than a hogshead, and makes nothing of breakfasting on a rhinoceros, bears no resemblance to the Phoenix. I suspect indeed, that the Arabic رخ is derived from the Hebrew רחם; which, Bochart says, was the white vulture; the *roch* of the Arabian fabulists may then be only an excessively exaggerated description of a real bird of prey.

The Arabian writers, however, speak of another imaginary bird, which they call عنقا, *anka*, and which may be thought to bear some resemblance to the Phoenix. R. Aben Ezra observes that in the language of Ismael, as he calls the Arabic, *anka* is the name of a thing, which is not to be found in the world, *nec fuit unquam creata, sed tantum usurpatur in parabolis, ut fatentur periti sermonis eorum*. The *anka* is generally considered by Oriental writers as the same with the Persian سیمرغ *simurgh*, and I shall therefore defer the comparison of the former with the Phoenix, until I come to speak of the latter. I shall, however, offer a few remarks on the word *anka*.

In a former part of this dissertation I endeavoured to show, that among the names from which φοῖνιξ was derived, we might reckon ענאק *Anak*, probably called by the Egyptians, according to the usage of their language, *Phanak*. But the original signification of *Anak* in Hebrew, and probably in Arabic, is *encircling*; and I have no doubt that *Anak*, though it might be the name of a man, was also a solar title. It is to be observed, that in the ancient languages, a regal title was also generally a solar one; and accordingly the Greeks have occasionally honoured even the mean-

est of the solar symbols with the dignified appellation of *ἄναξ*. I even think it not unlikely, that they borrowed this regal title from the Phœnicians, the *Beni-Anak*. That the sun was called *Phanax*, is unquestionable; and it appears to me, that this is nothing else than *anak*, or *anax*, prefixed by the Egyptian article *ph*. But if the Arabians gave the name of *anak* to a solar symbol, they would retain it pretty nearly in the same form in which it existed in the Phœnician, a dialect originally not very dissimilar to their own. Most certainly it seems inconceivable, that they should have given the name of *anka* or *anaka*, to their fabulous bird, if they only considered the meaning of the word, as it is now understood in their language. *אַנְכָּ* signifies "a neck." But if the *anka* be the same with the Phoenix, as some writers think, and consequently a symbol of the Sun, it may have derived its name from *anak*, (אֲנַךְ,) taken as a solar title, from the Sun's apparently making the circuit of the heavens.

I have already stated that the Jews were not unacquainted with the fable of the Phoenix, and that they named this imaginary bird *chol* and *aur-shinah*. But the Rabbins, in adding much to this fable, have not embellished it. According to their statements, the period of the Phoenix is a thousand years. Their accounts, however, do not seem to indicate, that they understood the allegory contained in the Egyptian story of this bird. It may indeed be remarked, that the Rabbinical writers often invented the most absurd fictions, without any view whatever to the instruction of their readers. The fables which they imagined seem to have been dictated merely by their love of the marvellous; and it would be vain to look in their writings for the elegant allegories, or the moral truths, which we find so often interwoven with the ingenious fictions of the Greeks and the Egyptians. I know not whether their story about the bird, which they call *Bar-juchne*, be founded on that of the Phoenix; but there is certainly no Arabian tale more irrational than this, in which the Jew must either believe, or reject the authority of the Talmud, where it is gravely stated, that one of the eggs of this enormous bird having fallen out of its nest, a forest of cedars was crushed beneath the mass, and sixty villages were swept away by the inundation caused by the breaking of the shell. The *Bar-Juchne*, (say the Rabbins,) shall be roasted and

served up, with the Leviathan and the Behemoth, at the banquet which shall be given to the children of Israel, when Messiah Ben-David shall come to reign over the world!

That there exists a striking resemblance between some of the Egyptian and Indian symbols, seems to be generally admitted; and as the figures of Ammon, and the Sphinx, are easily to be traced among the monuments of Hindostan, I thought it not unlikely, that the fable of the Phœnix might have found a place in the books of the Bramins. In this expectation however I have been disappointed. It is possible indeed, that the fable of the *Garuda* was founded on that of the Phœnix. This can be only ascertained by an appeal to the *Puranas*, in which an account of the *Garuda* is given. According to Sir W. Jones the *Garuda* is “a rational eagle,” and has “the face of a beautiful youth.” From Mr. Wilford we learn, that the *Garuda* daily devoured a serpent, until the King of the serpents retired with all his subjects to *Sancha-dwip*, where he sought and obtained the protection of *Swami-Cardiceya*, the God of arms. There is nothing in either of these stories to remind us of the Phœnix; but Mr. Paterson (*Asiatic Res.* Vol. 8.) recalls the Egyptian bird to our recollection, by telling us, that the *Garuda* “is perfect light, the dazzling full blaze of day, the type of truth, the celestial *vahan* of Vishnou.” The Indian bird, therefore, is clearly a solar symbol; and under this point of view may be compared with the Phœnix; though it may be thought to bear a yet stronger resemblance to the eagle of Jupiter, as it is represented soaring with Ganymede to heaven. In fact I cannot help suspecting, from the account given by Sir W. Jones, that the Indians framed their story of the *Garuda*, after having seen the rape of the son of Dardanus portrayed by the pencil or the chisel of some Grecian artist. Still it is to be remembered, that the eagle of Jupiter, like the Egyptian Phœnix, was a symbol of the Sun, and that Jupiter, otherwise called Diespiter, was himself a type of that luminary, originally adored by the Tsabeans as the emblem of the Deity. All the errors and all the fables of the Pagans, from India to Iceland, may be traced to heliolatry; and whether we speak of Vishnou, of Jupiter, or of Odin, we shall find that the system of Macrobius solves the enigma of nearly the whole of the Heathen mythology.

It will not appear extraordinary, that more distinct traces of the fable of the Phoenix should remain in Persia, than in any other country of the East, when it is considered, that Egypt continued to be a province of the Persian empire from the time of Cambyses to that of Alexander of Macedon. I shall briefly state what I have collected in the course of my reading upon this subject.

The Persian fabulists speak of an imaginary bird, which they call **کُکْنوس** *kuknos*. It is evident that this is nothing else than the Greek word **κύκνος**, *cygnus*, written in Persian characters; but the fable related of this bird shows, that the Persians confounded the fictions invented for the swan, with those imagined for the Phoenix. The *kuknos* is said to live for a thousand years; to sound the most harmonious notes, through a bill which contains no less than fifty orifices; to form a funeral pile for itself; and, as it expires amidst the flames, to give birth to its successor.

The Persians mention another bird, which may be also compared with the Phoenix. The learned Hyde, in his history of the religion of the ancient Persians, has the following sentence, in speaking of the solar titles. *Vocatur (scilicet Sol) quoque مرغ* MURGH, i. e. *avis, volucris; fortassis eâdem ratione quâ Ægyptiî Solem etiam Phanicem esse mysteriose fingeant: quam quidem fabulam explicavimus in notis nostris ad Itinera Mundi*. In turning to the **אֵנֶרֶת אֲרוֹחוֹת עוֹלָם** of Abraham Peritsol, which work Hyde has honoured with a commentary, I was rather disappointed to find absolutely nothing relative to the fable of the Phoenix, unless the following words be those to which the learned writer alluded—*Hinc etiam פִּימֶרְחָא avis dicta, quia rubra seu flammæa*. But the word *murgh* in Persian signifies, (I believe,) generally a bird, and the name is given sometimes to an aquatic fowl, sometimes to the nightingale, sometimes to the ostrich. I rather imagine, that the bird which Hyde meant to indicate was the *simurgh*. The Persian mythologists say, that this bird dwells among the mountains of *Kaf*, which girt the universe; that it existed before the creation; and that it has witnessed the duration of 12 periods, each consisting of 7000 years.

From this statement it is easy to see, that the Simurgh of the Persians, like the Phoenix of the Egyptians, was a symbol of the revolutions of time. Ormuzd is said to have reigned for 6000

years, and the empire of Ahriman was of the same duration. It is not difficult, even with no other help than that of the Zendavesta, to explain this enigma. The period of 12,000 years indicates the annual revolution partitioned into 12 months. The reign of Ormuzd lasts for six months, from the vernal to the autumnal equinox; and the reign of Ahriman begins with the autumnal equinox, and ends with the vernal. Ormuzd is the type of the Summer Sun; and Ahriman represents that luminary during the winter. The ancient Persians also appear to have held, that 12,000 years constituted the period of the creation; and it is remarkable, that the Etruscans had a similar tradition. Some allusion, however, seems to be made to the period assigned for the creation, and the Sabbath which followed it, in the book of Genesis, since the 7000 years, of which the Persian fabulists speak, may be reduced to seven days. The reign of Ormuzd for 6000 years may typify the six days, and the reign of Ahriman for 6000 years may typify the six nights, during which time the work of creation was going forwards. It is very possible, however, that other and more satisfactory solutions of these riddles may be given; while it still is evident, that the fable of the Simurgh relates to the duration of certain astronomical revolutions, or periods of time.

The name given to this bird seems to indicate, that it was considered as a symbol of the month. Among the Persians the month consisted of 30 days; and the word, *سیمرغ*, signifies a bird with the number "thirty" prefixed.

The *anka*, of which I have already spoken, is the same bird with the simurgh; but the Arabians seem to have added much to the tale. It is remarkable, that the Indians, Persians, and Arabians, represent the Garuda, the Simurgh, and the Anka, as a rational creature endowed with the gift of speech. In this respect the Orientalists have improved upon the fable of the Phoenix.

I am afraid that I have already detained my readers too long upon this subject. I shall therefore conclude with observing, that the story of the Phoenix contains one of the most elegant allegories to be found in the Egyptian mythology; and that this bird, while it represented time still progressive in its course, and commencing one period as another expired, was also a symbol of the human soul, which passes by death to life.

DE L'IMPROVISATION POETIQUE

Chez les Anciens, et particulièrement chez les Grecs et les Romains.

PAR M. RAOÛL-ROCHETTE.

Seconde Partie.

SECTION PREMIERE.

De l'Improvisation chez les Grecs.

AVANT d'examiner ce que fut l'Improvisation chez les Grecs, et les diverses formes sous lesquelles elle se produisit, il est important de fixer nos idées sur la nature de leur poésie, et de faire sentir la différence de leurs mœurs poétiques et des nôtres. Chez nous, un poète ne soumet ses productions au jugement des yeux et des oreilles, qu'après leur avoir fait subir lui-même la double épreuve de la méditation et de l'étude; ce n'est qu'à l'ombre des bois, ou dans le silence du cabinet qu'il se livre aux inspirations de son génie. Sa muse mystérieuse cherche les réduits les plus obscurs, et ne se plaît que dans les retraites les plus solitaires : l'éclat du jour, les applaudissemens du monde intimident ses transports naissans, arrêtent son premier essor, et ce n'est le plus souvent que par des veilles laborieusement prolongées, qu'il parvient à rendre ses vers dignes de son approbation et de la nôtre. Nous ne trouvons, dans la Grèce antique, rien qui se rapporte à ces idées : c'étoit surtout dans l'imposante solennité des assemblées publiques, ou dans la joyeuse yvresse des réunions privées, que le talent de ses poètes aimoit à se produire. Le spectacle des fêtes religieuses et patriotiques qui se succédoient presque sans intervalle chez cette nation spirituelle et sensible, offroit au génie poétique des occasions toujours sûres et toujours nouvelles, de paroître avec avantage. La présence même des objets les plus capables de l'inspirer, et la certitude de trouver, dans ce nombreux concours d'hommes également passionnés pour le plaisir et pour la gloire, des auditeurs enthousiastes plutôt que des juges sévères, tout excitoit la veine des poètes, tout enflammoit leur imagination; et les accords d'une musique harmonieuse ajoutaient encore à leur verve un nouveau degré d'exaltation. Tel est le sens de cette judicieuse remarque de Quintilien, dont je n'ai fait que développer l'esprit : “ *la crainte*

de ne pas répondre à l'attente de ses auditeurs, aussi bien que l'espoir de la surpasser, double les forces et enflamme le talent du poète ; et il y a cela de remarquable, que tandis que la composition exige la plus entière solitude, l'improvisation au contraire se plaît dans le grand nombre de témoins, comme le guerrier s'anime à l'aspect de ses drapeaux.¹”

C'est au milieu de ces fêtes, si favorables à la poésie, que les anciens en ont placé le berceau. Les premiers accens qu'elle fit entendre furent inspirés par le plaisir, dans les réunions champêtres, et, sur ce point, les graves témoignages des philosophes s'accordent avec les ingénieuses allégories des poètes.² Strabon dit³ que c'étoit un usage familier aux Grecs et aux Barbares d'accompagner les sacrifices divins de fêtes, dont l'enthousiasme et la Musique, (ce sont ses propres expressions,) faisoient communément les frais : ces mots indiquent certainement que, dans les fêtes religieuses de l'Antiquité, la plupart des poésies consacrées au culte, étoient à la fois improvisées et chantées. Et comment, en effet, ces hommes simples, qui ne cultivoient que pour leur agrément un art aussi grossier qu'eux, auroient-ils eu le loisir de se livrer à une étude pénible, surtout, quand les vives inspirations d'un cœur reconnoissant sembloient à leurs yeux l'hommage le plus digne de la divinité qu'ils adoroient ?

A mesure que la civilisation se perfectionna dans la Grèce, la poésie y prit chaque jour des formes plus savantes, sans cesser d'être consacrée aux usages les plus populaires. La langue de ses habitans étoit si riche et si variée, leur imagination si prompte et si féconde, que le langage des vers fut longtemps le seul dans lequel ils exprimèrent toutes leurs sensations, aussi bien que toutes leurs idées. Cette inclination générale pour la poésie n'a point échappé à la sagacité de Plutarque, et les expressions dont il se sert⁴, sont trop remarquables pour n'être pas ici fidèlement rapportées : “Telle étoit, dit-il, dans ces siècles reculés, la disposition des esprits, et la pente naturelle qui les entraînoit vers la poésie, que la moindre cause extérieure et l'illusion la plus légère suffi-

¹ Institut. Orator. lib. x. c. 6.

² Tibull. Eleg. lib. ii. cl. 1 ; Lucret. lib. v. sub init.

³ Strabo, Geograph. lib. x. p. 467 : τὰς μὲν μετ' ἐνθουσιασμοῦ, τὰς δὲ χωρὶς καὶ τὰς μὲν μετὰ μουσικῆς, τὰς δὲ μὴ.

⁴ De Pyth. Oracul. § xxiii. tom. ix. p. 286, Hutten :—Σωμάτων ἡνεκεν κράσεις καὶ φύσεις ὁ χρόνος ἐκείνος, εὗρον τι καὶ φορὸν ἐχούσας πρὸς ποίησιν, αἷς εὐθὺς ἐπεγίνοντο προθυμίαι καὶ ὄρμαι καὶ παρασκευαὶ ψυχῆς, ἵ τοι μὲν ὅτ' ἑτα ποιοῦσαι μικρὰς ἔξωθεν ἀρχῆς καὶ προτροπῆς (vulgò παροτροπῆς) τοῦ φανταστικοῦ δειομένην, ὥς ἐθ' ὅς τ' ἐλκεσθαι πρὸς τὸ οἰκίον οὐ μόνον—ἀστρολόγους καὶ φιλοσόφους, ἀλλ' ἐν οἶνῳ τὲ καὶ πίνῃσι (vulgò πάθει) γινομένους, οἵκου τινὸς ὑποδύντος, ἢ χαρᾶς προσπισούσης ὡλίσθαεν οἱ εἰς εὐωδὸν γῆρυν. J'ai admis dans ce passage deux corrections de Reiske, et j'ai changé la leçon vulgaire γινομένων en celle de γινομένων, qui m'a semblé faire un sens meilleur.

soient pour produire les plus violens mouvemens de l'âme, les transports les plus passionnés. Et ce n'étoit pas seulement chez les hommes d'un esprit plus cultivé, et sur les objets dont la connoissance leur étoit plus familière, que s'exerçoit cette étonnante vivacité d'imagination. Les impressions les plus subites de la joie ou du chagrin produisoient sur tous les hommes un effet semblable, et, soit dans l'ivresse des festins, soit dans l'accablement de la douleur, ils proféroient sans effort des chants harmonieux." Une pareille faculté est trop merveilleuse en elle-même, et trop contraire à toutes nos idées, pour n'avoir pas trouvé d'incrédules, et je ne suis pas surpris que Fontenelle se soit égayé aux dépens du bon Plutarque.¹ Ce bel esprit françois avoit trop peu de chaleur dans la tête et de sensibilité dans l'âme, pour croire réelle, pour concevoir même la nature du talent que le philosophe grec attribue à ses anciens compatriotes.

Par suite de cette disposition naturelle, et de l'habitude qu'elle avoit fait contracter aux Grecs, l'usage des vers étoit devenu si commun et si facile parmi eux, qu'ils l'appliquèrent bientôt à toutes sortes d'objets. C'est encore Plutarque qui m'en fournira la preuve :² " Il fut un temps, dit ailleurs ce savant et judicieux écrivain, où les vers accompagnés de chants servoient comme de monnoies du discours, où la poésie et la musique, outre les sujets qui leur sont propres, réunissoient à leur domaine l'histoire, la philosophie, et généralement la peinture de toutes les passions, et le récit de tous les faits de quelque importance." Enfin, ajoute le même auteur,³ on en vint au point de mettre en vers les discours relatifs aux diverses circonstances de la vie privée, à presque tous les besoins de la vie domestique. " Ce fut en vers chantés au son de la lyre, que la plupart des hommes adressèrent des *conseils*, des *consolations* ou des *reproches*. Ce fut en vers qu'ils débitèrent des *fables* ou des *maximes* applicables à ces différens motifs, et qu'ils composèrent, les uns *par une aptitude naturelle*, les autres *par l'effet de l'habitude*, des *Hymnes*, des *Péans* et des *Invocations* aux Dieux."

Il n'est pas nécessaire de développer le sens de ces divers témoignages ; l'improvisation y est marquée à des traits si caractéristiques, qu'il est impossible de s'y méprendre, quoiqu'elle n'y

¹ Fontenelle, Histoire des Oracles, dissertation ii. chap. v. Œuvres, tom. ii. p. 386, edit. in 8vo.

² De Ryth. Oracul. § xxiv : ἦν οὖν ὅτε λόγου νομίσμασιν ἰχρῶντο μέτροις καὶ μέλει καὶ ὠδαῖς, πᾶσαν μὲν ἱστορίαν καὶ φιλοσοφίαν, πᾶν δὲ πάθος, ὡς ἀπλῶς εἰπὲν καὶ πρᾶγμα σεμνοτέρως φωνῆς δεόμενον εἰς ποιήσιν καὶ μουσικὴν ἄγοντες.

³ Idem, ibidem : ὑπὸ τῆς πρὸς ποιητικὴν ἐπιτηδεύσεως, οἱ πλεῖστοι διὰ λύρας καὶ ὠδῆς ἰνουθέτου, ἐπαρρηβάζοντο, περικυλιούντο, μύθους καὶ παροιμίας ἐπείραιντο, ἔτι δὲ ὕμνους, θίων εὐχὰς, παῖνας, ἐν μέτροις ἐποιούντο καὶ μέλινον, οἱ μὲν δὲ εὐφύτα, οἱ δὲ διὰ συνηθείαν.

soit nulle part formellement exprimée. Comment croire, en effet, que dans des circonstances imprévues, et qui se renouveloient à chaque instant, ces hommes aient pu produire sans préparation, comme sans effort, des chants analogues à ces diverses occasions, si l'on n'admet pas qu'ils aient été doués de la faculté d'improviser sur toutes sortes de matières, soit que cette faculté ait été chez eux le fruit d'un don naturel, soit qu'ils l'eussent acquise par l'exercice et par l'étude ? C'est à cette faculté brillante, qui les rendoit aussi agréables qu'utiles à la société, que les Poètes durent principalement la considération dont ils vivoient environnés. C'est par elle qu'ils se virent élevés à la dignité d'un ministère public, et investis du glorieux privilège de promulguer les loix, et d'interpréter les volontés des Dieux. Les Poètes, dans les anciens temps de la Grèce, étoient regardés comme les législateurs des nations, comme les précepteurs du genre humain ; et les productions du génie poétique, qui ne sont que trop souvent considérées parmi nous comme une œuvre frivole, dont le moindre défaut est d'être indifférente au bonheur des peuples, jouissoient alors de ces profonds respects dus à des oracles de la morale. C'étoit pour les poètes, et pour les musiciens dont l'art étoit si étroitement lié avec le leur, qu'avoient été originairement imaginés les termes de *philosophes* et de *sophistes*,¹ dénominations honorables, que l'indigne abus qu'en firent depuis des orateurs mercenaires, fit tomber dans le mépris. Les expressions de *versificateur* et de *législateur* étoient presque synonymes ; Strabon les applique l'une et l'autre² à l'ancien poète *Thalétas*, qui florissoit avant Homère.³ Nous apprenons d'Aristote qu'avant l'invention des lettres on mettoit les loix en musique,⁴ et de là vient que, dans la langue des Grecs, le même mot désignoit à la fois un *chant versifié* et une *loi*.⁵ Mais cet usage, qu'Aristote semble restreindre à des temps presque barbares, se maintint même dans les siècles les plus éclairés. Solon, qui, à l'exemple des anciens chantres de la Grèce, réunit avec un égal succès la double qualité de législateur et de poète, écrivit en vers un *traité du gouvernement*, qui devoit servir de supplément à ses loix.⁶ Tyrnée, dont les chants belliqueux con-

¹ Eustath. ad Odyss. lib. i. p. 1404, lin. 15, ad. Rom. ; Athen. Deipnosoph. lib. xiv. c. 15.

² Strabo, Geograph. lib. x. μελοποιῶ ἀνδρὶ καὶ νομοθετικῶ.

³ Cf. Suidam. v. Θαλήτας ; Plutarch. de Musicâ, § vii. ; Sext. Empiric. advers. Mathematic. lib. ii.

⁴ Aristot. Problem. § xix. prob. 28.

⁵ Burette, Académ. des Inscript. tom. x. p. 218. mém.

⁶ Plutarch. in Solon, § iii. : ce poème politique renfermoit cinq mille vers, au témoignage de Diogène de Laërte (lib. i. c. 2. § 14). Les loix mêmes de Solon avoient été mises par lui en vers, et Plutarque nous en a conservé (ibidem) les deux premiers.

duisirent les Spartiates à la victoire, laissa parmi eux un monument plus durable de son génie et de leur reconnoissance, un code de loix écrit en beaux vers.¹ Téspandre mit en musique celles de Lycurgue,² ce qui suppose qu'elles étoient également rédigées dans un mètre poétique. Les Thusiens d'Italie, dont l'établissement est d'une époque bien plus moderne encore,³ chantoient dans leurs festins les loix de Charondas,⁴ et ne se faisoient point scrupule de mêler ces graves conceptions de la sagesse aux folâtres jeux de la joie bachique. Enfin, le même usage, étendu à une foule d'actes et de décrets publics, paroît avoir été général dans un grand nombre de villes grecques.⁵

On peut tirer de ces faits deux conséquences importantes. La première, c'est que les Grecs étoient doués d'une singulière facilité pour composer des vers, puisqu'ils y mettoient les choses en apparence les plus contraires à la poésie : la seconde, c'est que les Poètes, interprètes immédiats des volontés des Dieux et des intentions du législateur, devoient posséder au plus haut degré ce talent, qui semble avoir formé le partage de leur nation entière, et la principale attribution de leur ministère. Aussi, ne les considéroit-on pas comme des êtres vulgaires, pour qui l'art des vers n'étoit qu'un métier obscur, qu'une profession vouée à des occupations solitaires. Ils étoient les compagnons et les conseillers assidus des Princes; admis à leurs festins et mêlés dans toutes leurs délibérations, pour leur rappeler sans cesse les loix de la modération et de la justice, que fait trop souvent oublier l'ivresse du plaisir et du pouvoir, ils savoient tempérer l'austérité fâcheuse de ces leçons par les charmes irrésistibles de leur poésie.⁶ C'étoit en eux que résidoit tout l'exercice de la morale publique; c'étoient eux qui faisoient tout l'ornement des réunions privées; et les mêmes hommes, dont la voix mâle et forte excitoit l'amour des vertus guerrières, savoient aussi, par des accens doux et paisibles, inspirer le goût des vertus domestiques. Voyez le magnifique portrait qu'Hésiode trace⁷ des poètes, ses contemporains et ses rivaux, dont il partageoit les honneurs et dont il surpassoit les talens. Il les représente, dissipant, aux seuls accens de leur voix, les funestes dissentimens qui s'élèvent parmi les hommes; apaisant partout la

¹ Suidas, v. Τύρταος.

² Clement. Alexand. Stromat. lib. i. p. 308.

³ Voy. notre Hist. Critique de l'Etabliss. des Colonies Grecques, tom. iv. p. 33. et suiv.

⁴ Hermipp. apud Athen. lib. xiv. c. 6.

⁵ Martian. Capell. lib. ix. : Græcarum urbium multæ ad lyram leges decretaque publica recitabant.

⁶ Voyez, dans Athénée, (lib. xiv. c. 11.) l'éloge de la Musique qui s'applique aussi à la Poésie.

⁷ Hesiod. Theogon. v. 81—103.

discorde, et faisant naître le plaisir ; donnant aux rois et aux peuples de sages avis, et d'utiles exemples ; recueillant enfin, pour récompense de leurs travaux, la faveur des princes et la vénération de leurs sujets.

Je vois d'ici mes lecteurs sourire à ces séduisantes images, et je conviens, qu'en ne prenant pour règle de ce qui peut être, que ce qui est, le tableau de nos mœurs actuelles nous dispose peu à croire celui que je viens de tracer des mœurs de la Grèce antique. Dans un siècle, où les guerres de plume excitées par la poésie, sont si communes et si violentes, comment imaginer qu'il fut un temps où la Poésie devint un lien de paix et de charité parmi les hommes, et que les vers, qui causent aujourd'hui tant de troubles dans le monde, servirent autrefois à y maintenir la tranquillité ? Mais ce n'est pas là, aux yeux de l'homme éclairé et de l'observateur impartial, la seule différence essentielle qui distingue notre société de celle des Grecs, et des faits viennent encore à l'appui de ces observations générales. Avant de partir pour la fatale expédition de Troie, Agamemnon avoit laissé à Mycènes un poète chargé de veiller sur la conduite de son épouse, et de la retenir, par la douce autorité de son génie, dans le sentier de la vertu, dont elle n'étoit que trop disposée à s'écarter. Ce chancre fidèle réussit longtemps, par des exhortations habilement soutenues du charme des vers et de la mélodie, à empêcher la défaite de cette malheureuse princesse, et l'on sait qu'Égysthe ne parvint enfin à triompher de sa résistance, qu'après avoir éloigné de sa personne le vertueux poète qu'il n'avoit pu corrompre.¹

Homère nous offre encore d'autres exemples de ces mœurs antiques. Le *Phémios*, qu'il introduit dans le palais d'*Ulysse*,² prodiguoit à regret ses chants devant les insolens amans de *Pénélope*. Forcé longtemps de se soumettre à la nécessité, il obtint aisément sa grâce, lorsqu'*Ulysse*, vainqueur de ses rivaux, s'appretoit à le punir comme un de leurs complices, et *Télémaque* lui rendit hautement le témoignage, qu'il avoit vainement cherché à s'affranchir d'un joug sous lequel ce fils du Héros avoit été contraint de plier lui-même. Le *Démodocus*, qui embellissoit les festins d'*Alcinoüs* par les accords de sa lyre et par les inspirations de sa muse, n'avoit jamais, plus heureux ou plus sage que *Phémios*, prostitué son talent à d'indignes usages. Aussi Homère nous le représente-t-il toujours³ comme jouissant à la cour du Prince et parmi ses propres concitoyens des honneurs qu'il méritoit à double titre par son génie et par son caractère. Enfin, *Virgile*, peintre aussi fidèle des mœurs grecques, que soigneux imitateur des

¹ Hom. Odyss. lib. iii. v. 267, et sqq. Eustath. ad hunc loc.

² Homer. Odyss. lib. i. v. 154, lib. xxii. v. 347.

³ Homer. Odyss. lib. viii. v. 44, 62, et al.

conceptions homériques, place parmi les convives de la reine de Carthage,¹ un Poète qu'il nomme *Iopas*, et qui célèbre dans ses vers les beautés et les secrets de la nature, sujet grave et sublime qui convenoit encore aux oreilles de Didon chaste et vertueuse.

Si ces exemples confirment les témoignages de Plutarque, relativement à l'usage qu'on faisoit anciennement dans la Grèce de la poésie et des poètes, ils prouvent aussi que cette poésie étoit le plus souvent *improvisée*, et que ces poètes, dans leurs compositions morales ou politiques, ne faisoient qu'obéir à l'inspiration du moment. C'étoit cette prodigieuse facilité de s'exprimer en vers sur tous les sujets et dans toutes les circonstances que peut offrir la vie publique et privée, qui avoit fait croire aux hommes superstitieux de l'antiquité, que le talent de ces poètes étoit l'effet de l'influence immédiate de la Divinité, et qui les faisoit considérer eux-mêmes comme des êtres surnaturels. C'est en ces termes que Platon, qui méprisoit les versificateurs de son temps, parle des véritables poètes. Il n'accorde ce titre qu'à ceux qui sont saisis d'un souffle impétueux et divin ; il prétend que l'art ne doit point présider à leurs compositions ; que l'enthousiasme seul doit les produire. Il revient souvent sur cette idée, et la présente sous toutes les formes, toujours avec la même assurance ; son style revêt aussi l'éclat et la couleur de ses pensées, et l'on diroit qu'en cet endroit Platon a voulu offrir un modèle de l'inspiration dont il fait un précepte :² “ Les poètes, dit-il, prétendent qu'ils puisent à des sources de miel et de lait ; que, semblables aux abeilles, et portés, comme elles, sur des ailes légères, ils cueillent dans les jardins des muses les fleurs brillantes dont ils décorent leurs vers ; et ils disent la vérité. Un poète, en effet, est un être léger, ailé et sacré. Rien ne sort de sa veine, s'il n'est tout entier au pouvoir de la Divinité, si sa raison ne s'égare et ne s'éteint. C'est uniquement lorsqu'échauffé par l'harmonie et le rythme, il entre dans le délire, qu'il compose ces poèmes dignes d'une éternelle admiration. ...L'art ne produit jamais ces merveilles ; c'est la faveur céleste qui les opère, et qui, selon les caprices de la muse, dicte à chaque poète des chants analogues à la nature de son génie ; à celui-ci, des *Dithyrambes* ; à celui-là, des *Eloges* ; à tel autre des vers *Epiques* ou des *Iambes*. Aucun d'eux ne réussit dans un genre étranger à son talent, parce que ce talent lui-même n'est pas l'effet de l'art, mais celui d'une inspiration surnaturelle....C'est ainsi, ajoute Platon, que la Divinité, mettant à profit les dispositions diverses qu'ils apportent en naissant, les fait servir d'instrumens aveugles à ses volontés, d'interprètes dociles à ses oracles, afin de nous con-

¹ Virgil. *Æneid.* lib. i. v. 744, et Servius ad hunc loc.

² Plato, in *Ion.* tom. i. p. 534, 535.

vaincre que tant de belles choses, qui échappent à des êtres privés de sens et de raison, émanent du Dieu même qui les inspire et qui s'exprime par leur bouche."

A l'appui de ces idées, Platon cite l'exemple d'un poète qui étoit de *Chalcis*, en Eubée, et qui se nommoit *Tynnichus*. Sans avoir jamais rien écrit qui fut digne d'être recueilli, il prononça, par le seul effet de cette influence surnaturelle, un *hymne* ou *péan*, qui fut bientôt dans toutes les bouches, et qui, de l'aveu même de l'auteur, n'étoit cependant qu'une *production dépourvue d'art et créée sans travail*. "Il semble," dit encore Platon, "que la Divinité, en proférant le plus beau des hymnes par l'organe du plus médiocre des poètes, ait voulu montrer que ces vers, objets de l'admiration des hommes, ne sont pas des œuvres mortelles et de main humaine, mais des ouvrages divins et créés par les Dieux." Qu'on ne suppose pas que ces idées fussent particulières à Platon, et que l'imagination, à laquelle cet éloquent écrivain dut ses défauts aussi bien que ses beautés, l'ait encore entraîné ici hors des bornes de la vérité. En admettant que ses principes ne soient pas incontestables, le fait dont il les autorise, ne sauroit du moins être contesté. D'ailleurs, Aristote, qui, comme l'on sait, ne se faisoit pas un devoir de conformer ses opinions à celles du fondateur de l'académie, et qui même adopta souvent des systèmes contraires, par cela seul qu'ils étoient opposés à ceux de son maître, le grave et méthodique Aristote distingue aussi deux sortes de poètes, ceux qui le deviennent par l'effet d'une disposition naturelle, et ceux qui ne doivent ce talent qu'à un état passager d'aliénation.¹ Ces dernières paroles indiquent clairement, ce me semble, le ravissement extatique dans lequel Platon vouloit que fussent plongés les sens du poète, pendant tout le temps que duroit sa composition. Le même Aristote confirme ailleurs par un exemple l'induction que je tire ici de son témoignage ; il cite² un poète de Syracuse, nommé *Maracus*, qui ne faisoit jamais de meilleurs vers que lorsqu'il entroit dans le délire. Un autre philosophe, dont les écrits sont depuis longtemps perdus, mais dont l'opinion sur la poésie nous a été transmise par un poète, Démocrite, qui affecta souvent de déguiser sous des formes originales et bizarres des idées pleines de goût et de solidité, excluait formellement, de l'Hélicon, quiconque n'éprouvoit pas cette ivresse,³ ce délire, cet embrasement d'imagination, (ce sont les propres expressions de l'Abbé Arnaud, dont je me sers ici,⁴) en un mot cet enthousiasme qui élève

¹ Aristot. in Poëtic.

² Aristot. in Problemat. § xxx. prob. i. tom. ii. p. 626. : *Μαρακὸς δὲ ὁ Συρακούσιος καὶ ἀμείνων ἦν ποιητὴς ὅτ' ἐκσταίη.*

³ — extrudit sanos Helicone Poëtas

Democritus, Horat. Art. Poët. v. 296.

⁴ Des Improvisateurs, Œuvres Complètes, tom. ii. p. 98.

l'homme au-dessus de lui-même, le transporte dans un nouvel univers, et en faisant taire la raison, souvent même en la troublant, répand sur tous les objets une force et une lumière extraordinaires. Est-il possible d'exprimer plus formellement le caractère d'inspiration qui régnoit dans de pareils ouvrages, et cette inspiration accordée à des poètes sans génie et sans art, tels que Tynnichus et Maracus, peut-elle se concilier avec le travail lent et pénible des méditations poétiques ? n'est-elle pas l'improvisation même ?

Pour achever de nous en convaincre, il suffira d'examiner les expressions, par lesquelles Homère désigne les deux poètes qu'il introduit dans son Odyssée. Lorsque Phémios, menacé par Ulysse, se jette à ses genoux pour implorer sa clémence : *je suis, lui dit-il, instruit par moi-même, c'est à dire, mon talent n'est pas le fruit de l'art ni de l'étude ; il est un don de la nature, et le résultat de l'inspiration.*¹ Il ajoute : *la Divinité mit en moi toutes sortes de chants.* N'est-ce pas encore comme s'il lui disoit ? *je possède, par une faveur spéciale des Dieux, la faculté de chanter à l'improvisiste sur toutes sortes de sujets ?* C'est le même sens que nous devons donner aux paroles dont se sert Homère en parlant de Démodocus : *un Dieu lui accorda le talent des vers, et la faculté de chanter sur tous les sujets que son génie lui suggère.*² L'inspiration spontanée me paroît clairement caractérisée par ces derniers mots ; et, comme si ce poète eût voulu prévenir toute espèce d'incertitude à cet égard, il nous en fournit lui-même la preuve matérielle. Démodocus prélude à ses chants, après avoir pris en main sa lyre, et fait placer devant lui la coupe de vin destinée à exalter son génie ;³ *c'est la muse elle-même qui dicte ses vers*, selon les propres expressions d'Homère,⁴ et le reste de son récit désigne encore mieux un poème produit sans préparation. Ulysse, charmé du talent que le poète a déployé dans la peinture des désastres de l'armée grecque,⁵ lui propose, pour sujet d'un nouveau poème, de chanter l'aventure du cheval de bois, le stratagème d'Ulysse, et la destruction de Troie par la main des guerriers enfermés dans les flancs de cette machine : “ Si tu traites dignement un si noble sujet, poursuit Ulysse, je n'hésiterai plus à proclamer ton génie en présence des hommes, et j'avouerai hautement que tes vers partent d'une inspiration divine.” L'occasion étoit brillante, et l'épreuve délicate ; un seul instant de retard, en pré-

¹ Homer. Odyss. lib. xxii. v. 347.

² Homer. Odyss. lib. viii. v. 44 : τῷ γάρ ῥα θεὸς περιδῶκεν ἀοιδὴν ———— τέχην, ὅππῃ θυμὸς ἐποτρύνῃσιν αἰεῖδεν.

³ Hom. Odyss. v. 70 : πὰρ δὲ δέπας οἶοιο πειν, ὅτε θυμὸς ἀνάγοι.

⁴ Ibidem, v. 73 : μοῦσ' ἄρ' ἀοιδὸν ἀνέκκεν.

⁵ Hom. Odyss. lib. viii. v. 487, et seq.

sence d'auditeurs dont l'attente étoit si vivement excitée et l'opinion déjà si favorablement prévenue, un seul indice d'embarras ou d'hésitation, pouvoit porter à la réputation du poète une atteinte funeste et irréparable. Démodocus ne paroît pas sentir tout le danger de sa situation, ou plutôt il le brave, pour mieux en triompher. Le défi d'Ulysse et la promesse flatteuse qui le termine, enflamment subitement son imagination, et, sans donner à ses juges ni à lui-même le moment de la réflexion, il commence à célébrer le fameux événement indiqué à sa muse. La rapidité de cette action est rendue sensible par celle des expressions même d'Homère :¹ l'impulsion immédiate et soudaine de la Divinité y est formellement exprimée, et l'on ne trouvera nulle part, ce me semble, l'absence de toute préparation plus manifestement prouvée que dans ce passage de l'Odyssée. Je ne crois donc pas m'abuser en induisant des propres témoignages de l'auteur, qu'il a voulu désigner ici deux *chantres improvisateurs*; et, si l'opinion de Didyme, d'Eustathe et des autres commentateurs d'Homère, qui prétendent que ce poète s'est peint lui-même dans le personnage de Démodocus, doué de l'inspiration divine, et privé de la vue, si cette opinion, dis-je, est aussi vraie qu'elle me paroît vraisemblable, ce ne seroit pas être trop hardi, que de prononcer, dès à présent et par suite de ma première induction, ce que j'établirai bientôt par des preuves irrécusables, qu'Homère étoit aussi un poète improvisateur.

On alléguera peut-être, qu'Homère, usant du privilège accordé aux poètes, n'a mis en scène dans les divers passages que j'ai cités, que des personnages imaginaires. Mais cette objection auroit peu de force par elle-même, et je la crois d'ailleurs absolument dénuée de fondement. D'abord, en admettant que les personnages de Phémios et de Démodocus, ne soient point historiques, comme la plupart de ceux qu'il a introduits dans ses poèmes, il ne s'ensuivroit pas de là que la faculté qu'il leur accorde soit purement fictive ou idéale. Il est permis à un poète de créer de nouveaux acteurs, et de modifier des traditions reçues, selon les besoins de sa fable, et la tournure particulière de ses idées. Mais cette liberté ne s'étend pas, que je sache, jusqu'à supposer à ses personnages des mœurs entièrement chimériques; et l'on doit soupçonner Homère, moins qu'aucun autre poète, d'avoir pris une licence aussi condamnable. Ce qui fait surtout le charme de ses tableaux, c'est la pureté de son dessin, et la franchise de son coloris; tous les traits, toutes les nuances en sont exactement puisés dans la nature, et lors même que ses conceptions s'éloignent le plus de la vérité historique, il respecte constamment la vérité morale. Peintre fidèle des antiques exploits et des mœurs

¹ Ὡς φάθ' ὁ δ' ὀρμηθεὶς θεοῦ, ἤρχιτο φαίνει δ' ἀοιδῆν.

contemporaines, il ne fait agir et parler ses personnages que conformément aux habitudes et aux idées de leur âge, et, comme ce siècle différoit peu, sinon par les temps, du moins par les coutumes, de celui où il écrivoit lui-même, on reconnoît, en le lisant, que la tradition le guide presque autant que son génie, et la naïveté de ses expressions semble attester partout la fidélité de ses récits. Aussi plusieurs critiques lui reprochèrent-ils, avec plus de fondement, quoiqu'avec encore moins de justice, d'avoir peint dans toute leur simplicité les mœurs des tems qui l'avoient précédé.¹ Il n'est donc pas probable que, dans les portraits si parfaitement analogues qu'il nous a tracés de Phémios et de Démodocus, il ne se soit appliqué à peindre que des êtres imaginaires, et qu'aucun modèle existant ou connu ne lui en ait fourni les traits ou inspiré l'idée.

Je me défierois de mes idées, même dans le cas où elles me paroîtroient le plus conformes aux témoignages de l'antiquité et aux principes de la critique, si je voyois qu'elles me fussent particulières : et j'ai pour règle de suspendre mon jugement, jusqu'à ce qu'il me paroisse suffisamment autorisé. L'illusion, qui résulte des argumens favorables à notre opinion, est si naturelle et si involontaire, qu'on ne sauroit trop se mettre en garde contre cette dangereuse séduction ; quand il s'agit de preuves purement morales, il seroit injuste d'exiger des autres la même conviction qu'elles ont opérée en nous, et les degrés de croyance ne doivent se déterminer que d'après ceux de l'autorité. Mais, quand je vois des idées, suffisamment raisonnables en elles-mêmes, partagées, dans leur application rigoureuse, par un critique d'un goût aussi fin que d'une érudition profonde, puis-je exprimer, avec les restrictions du doute, une opinion qui réunit alors tous les caractères de la vérité ? Ce critique est M. Pope, qui ne se borna pas à donner à son pays la meilleure traduction poétique de *l'Iliade*, qui ait été encore exécutée dans nos idiômes modernes, mais qui voulut mériter également bien de la république entière des lettres par ses *recherches sur la personne et les écrits d'Homère*. On sait que ce morceau de critique, si recommandable à double titre, et par le grand poète qui en est l'objet, et par celui qui en est l'auteur, surpasse autant, par la finesse et la solidité du jugement, que par la profondeur et l'étendue des connoissances, tous les autres écrits composés sur le même sujet, et que les opinions de Pope, comme savant et comme homme de goût, méritent ici d'être doublement considérées. On me permettra donc d'ajouter plus de confiance à mes idées, quand je les trouve conformes aux siennes, et mes lecteurs me sauront gré sans doute de mettre sous leurs yeux le témoignage original, dont ils soupçonneroient peut-être que j'aurois

¹ Voy. Barthélemy, Voyage du J. Anacharsis, Introduction, art. Homère.

pu interpréter inexactement les paroles : “ What sort of poets Homer saw in his own time, may be gathered from his description of Demodocus and Phemius, whom he has introduced to celebrate his profession. The imperfect risings of the art lay then among the *extempore singers* of stories at banquets, who were half singers, half musicians.”¹

L'histoire, au reste, confirme encore des observations fondées sur la nature même des poésies d'Homère ; l'histoire nous apprend que Phémios et Démodocus existèrent réellement tels qu'il les a dépeints, et dans le siècle et dans les lieux où il les a placés. Démétrius de Phalère les cite² l'un et l'autre parmi les plus anciens *chantres* dont la tradition littéraire eut conservé le souvenir. L'auteur de la *vie d'Homère* attribuée à Hérodote parle³ d'un Phémios qui enseignoit les Belles-Lettres à Smyrne, et qui fut le précepteur et le père adoptif d'Homère ; d'où l'on a conjecturé que ce poète avoit depuis consacré dans son Odyssée le nom et l'éloge d'un instituteur dont la mémoire lui devoit être chère à tant de titres. C'est sans doute à cette source qu'Eustathe avoit puisé la tradition qu'il rapporte sur l'existence et sur la profession de Phémios,⁴ et Plutarque ne fait point difficulté d'admettre cette tradition, comme certaine et absolument historique ;⁵ enfin, dans un autre traité faussement attribué au même écrivain, mais dont l'auteur s'appuie sur le témoignage d'Ephore, il est fait mention de Phémios, *qui professoit les Belles-Lettres à Smyrne*.⁶ Je pourrois produire, à l'égard de Démodocus, les mêmes autorités, et j'en ajouterois d'autres encore, si je croyois qu'elles pussent donner plus de poids aux premières.⁷ Mais je ne dois pas négliger une observation de Plutarque sur le caractère de la poésie de ces deux chantres improvisateurs. Il remarque⁸ que *la diction de leurs poèmes étoit asservie aux mêmes mètres que celle de Stésichore et des autres anciens poètes, qui, dans le même temps qu'ils composoient leurs vers, y adaptoient les airs conve-*

¹ An Essay on the Life, Writings, and Learning of Homer, sect. iii. p. 81—82.

² Apud Isac. Tzetz. Prolegom. ad Cassand.

³ Vita Homer. Herodot. § iv. v. xxvi.

⁴ Enstath. ad Odys. lib. i. v. 154, p. 1404, lin. 15 : Τὸν δὲ Φῆμιον ἡ παλαιὰ ἱστορία διδάσκαλον γενέσθαι λίγει τοῦ ποιητοῦ. L'épithète de *μούσαις κατόχον* qu'il lui donne, me semble désigner assez bien un improvisateur.

⁵ Plutarch. de Music. § iii.

⁶ τῷ σμυρναίῳ διδασκάλῳ γραμμάτων, apud Plutarch. tom. xiv. p. 475.

⁷ Plutarch. et Demetr. Phaler. loc. laud. add. Eustath. ad Odys. lib. iii. v. 267, p. 1466, lin. 56—60 ; Ptolem. Hephæst. lib. vii. p. 335, edit. Thom. Gale ; Ovid. in Ibin, v. 274. Voyez Burette, Académie des Inscript. tom. x. p. 206, mém.

⁸ Plutarch. ibidem. Voy. sur ce passage important les réflexions de M. Burette, loc. laud. p. 209—212.

nables. Ce passage, rapproché de tous ceux par lesquels j'ai essayé d'établir la nature du talent de Phémios et de Démodocus, achève de prouver la justesse de notre opinion ; et l'on ne sauroit maintenant douter que ces productions, nées sans préparation sur des sujets imprévus, et accompagnées du son des instrumens, n'aient été à la fois et de véritables poèmes et des poèmes improvisés.

Je n'ai point cité jusqu'ici le témoignage de Platon, relativement à l'existence de Phémios, quoiqu'il fut assurément un des plus graves et des plus anciens que je pusse alléguer en ma faveur. C'est dans son *Dialogue d'Ion*, dont j'ai déjà rapporté plusieurs passages, que Platon parle de Phémios, d'Ithaque, et lui donne le titre de *Rhapsode*.¹ Je pourrois, dès à présent, conclure de ce témoignage, que l'art des Rhapsodes, tel au moins qu'il étoit cultivé dans les siècles antérieurs à Homère, n'étoit que celui des improvisateurs ; et les considérations dont Platon accompagne ce fait littéraire, justifieroient sans doute, aux yeux de mes lecteurs, comme aux miens, l'importante induction que j'en tire. En négligeant ainsi mes propres avantages, j'ai acquis le droit de ne point m'arrêter à combattre les opinions systématiques qui contrarient la mienne, et je crois que la peine que je m'épargne, est un ennui que j'évite à mes lecteurs. Seroit-il, par exemple, fort utile à leur instruction et nécessaire au succès de ma cause, de réfuter les assertions, tout au moins très hazardées, de Dion Chrysostome, sur l'ignorance absolue où l'on étoit touchant le nom du précepteur d'Homère et les autres particularités de la destinée de ce poète ?² comme si le sentiment de ce Rhéteur moderne, quelque recommandable qu'il soit à plusieurs égards, pouvoit prévaloir sur une réunion de témoignages puisés aux plus pures sources de l'antiquité ? Je dois encore moins m'inquiéter du scepticisme dédaigneux de M. Wolf, qui, sans donner d'autres preuves de son opinion, que son opinion elle-même, rejette³ parmi les contes les plus extravagans, l'existence de Thémios et de Pronapis attestée par Diodore et par d'autres auteurs.⁴ Il me semble qu'on peut se dispenser de combattre des assertions, qui, ne reposant sur aucune base, ne sauroient faire aucune autorité. Que si l'on admet, comme règle de critique, que chacun peut, en ne suivant que ses propres idées, traiter de rêveries et de contes populaires toutes les traditions anciennes qui ne s'accordent point avec elles ;

¹ Plato, in *Ione* ; tom. i. p. 534 : Περὶ τοῦ Φημίου Ἰθακησίου ῥαψωδοῦ.

² Dion. Chrysost. Orat. LV. de Socrat. et Homer.

³ Prolegomen. ad Homer. § xiv. p. xlix : Igitur mittamus falsi Herodoti Phemium, &c.

⁴ Diodor. Sic. lib. iii. c. 66 ; Tatian. Orat. ad Græcos, c. 62 ; Theodos. in Schol. ad Dionys. Thrac. vid. Fabric. Biblioth. Græc. i. 27 ; Wesseling, ad Diodor. Sic., tom. ii. p. 558, edit. Bipont.

s'il est permis de rejeter comme un écrivain absurde et visionnaire, tout auteur dont le sentiment ne se rapportera point au nôtre, il sera, j'en conviens, bien plus commode d'écrire ainsi l'histoire ; et la critique perdra, par ce moyen, plusieurs des grandes difficultés qui en ont rendu jusqu'ici l'étude si redoutable et le talent si rare. Mais, en tout cas, j'espère qu'on ne me refusera pas le droit que chacun s'arroe, de composer l'histoire à sa manière, et que, pourvu que la vraisemblance s'y trouve, les témoignages que j'ai allégués à l'appui de mes idées, ne seront pas un motif pour les condamner. Qu'on ne me tienne pas compte de la peine que j'ai prise de recueillir ces témoignages ; qu'on blâme même la faiblesse que j'ai d'y ajouter foi ; j'y consens : mais, du moins, qu'on me juge, comme mes adversaires, d'après mes propres opinions, indépendamment des preuves étrangères dont j'ai cru devoir les appuyer.

(On donnera la suite au No. prochain.)

E. H. BARKERI

Amœnitates Criticæ et Philologicæ.[†]

PARS PRIMA.

[†]ABAAE. Pseudo-Herodiani Epimerismi Mss.: Τὰ εἰς αἱ λήγοντα ἐπιρρήματα διὰ τῆς αἱ διφθόγγου γράφονται, οἷον βαβαί, παπαί, οὐαί, ἀταταί, καὶ ἀπλῶς ὅσα θρηνητικά, πλὴν τοῦ ἀβάλε, ἀντὶ τοῦ φεῦ. Pseudo-Herod. nostro (cum Hesych. Suid. Phavor. Zonar. Etymol. Dracone, auctore Regularum de Prosod. ap. Herman. Gr. Gr. p. 445. 109. et Philem. in Lex. Technol.) est Ἀβάλε, non Ἀβαλε. V. nov. Thes. Gr. L. p. 26. A. Ἀβάλε aliquando per αἱ scribi, in eodem novo Thes. Gr. L. p. 25. B. et nott. 1, 2. dicitur. Hujus scripturæ origo e Grammaticorum canone, Τὰ εἰς αἱ λήγοντα ἐπιρρήματα καὶ ἀπλῶς ὅσα θρηνητικά, διὰ τῆς αἱ διφθόγγου γράφονται, petenda est. Sed ἀβάλε cum nostro Grammatico excipere debuerant. “ Vulgo Hebræorum Magistri, quoties vel mala imprecantur, vel detestantur alium, τῷ חבֿל, *chabal*, utuntur : id autem חֵלֶם, sive *væ* interpretatur Elias : ut cum Thargumistæ, חֵלֶם חבֿל, *væ mihi*. Quod *chabal* de proditore suo usurpavit Dominus, cum dixit, ‘ Et filius quidem hominis, prout definitum est, abit, verum-

[†] Voces asterisco notatæ in H. Stephani Thes. Gr. L. desiderantur.

tamen vae homini illi per quem proditur:’ quod Syrus η, vae, ibi aliisque locis dixit. Quemadmodum tum Gr. Latinisque etiam particulis non raro utebantur Syri. Forte et vicissim suum ἀβάλε ex eo fecerunt Græci. (Nihil enim usitatius quam ut aspiratio rejiciatur: quomodo a ἡρη, Ἀκελδαμά, nec pauca ejus generis.) Extat autem cum alibi, tum in Gr. Epigram. Anthol.

Ἀβάλε χειμερίου με διέκλυσε χεῖματα πόντου
Δειλαίην.

de navi hominibus amissis servata. Hesych. inter alia, ἀχρεῖον, inutile aut *infaustum*, alii φεῦ interpretantur. Ut sic mutuam inter sese linguæ navent operam. De Græca autem voce mirum quæ linguarum harum imperiti.” D. Heinsii Exerc. Sacr. p. 247.

ἈΒΡΟΒΙΟΣ. “H. Steph. laudat Dionysium in Perieg. v. 968., Οὐχ ὡς ἀβροβίων Ἀράβων γένος. Gloss. Ἀβροβίων πλουσίων.” D. Scottus in App. Ad quas Glossas respexerit Scottus, nescio. In Eustathii enim Comment. non leguntur. Vide nov. *Thes. Gr. L.* p. 47. A.

* ἈΚΑΙΝΟΝ. In Olympiodori loco, ab Jablonskio Gloss. Vocc. Aeg. (vide nov. *Thes. Gr. L.* p. ccxlv. a.) laudato, lege, cum SCHNEIDERO in Indice ad Rei Rust. Scrip. v. Aenua: Διὸ δὴ καὶ ἐπινενόηται παρ’ αὐτοῖς μέτρον, ὅπερ ἄκαινον καλοῦσι παρὰ τὸ στέρησιν ποιεῖν τοῦ φόνου. Tewaterus edidit, Διὸ δὲ κ. ἐπινενόηται— τοῦ στέρησιν.

* ἈΛΙΣΚΑΖΩ. Versus ab Jablonskio Gloss. Vocc. Aeg. (nov. *Thes. Gr. L.* p. cxlix.) laudatus, legitur in Epigr. ἀδεσπ. DXC. T. iv. p. 241. ubi editur, ut edere debuerat Tewaterus: Πετράων τ’ ἐφύπερθεν ἀλυσκάζοντας Ἰσαύρους.

* ἈΛΥΣ. Clem. Alex. Pædag. p. 297, 5.: Αἰδῶς μὲν ἐπανθεῖτω, καὶ ἀρρενωπία, ἀπέστω δὲ καὶ ὁ ἀπὸ τῶν μυροπωλίων, καὶ χρυσοχοίων, καὶ ἔριοπωλίων ἄλυσ, καὶ ὁ ἀπὸ τῶν ἄλλων ἐργαστηρίων, ἐνθα καὶ ἐταιρικῶς κεκοσμημέναι, ὥσπερ ἐπὶ τέγους καθεζόμεναι, διημερεύουσι. Sic edidit Potterus. (Vide nov. *Thes. Gr. L.* p. ccclv. b.) Versio Latina: ‘Myropolarum, aurificum, lanificum, ceterarumque officinarum *caligo*.’ Sed SCHNEIDERUS in Lex. ubi scribitur cum leni spiritu ἄλυσ, rectius, ut puto, intelligit “ὄχλος, *die Menge Putzwerk*.”

* ἈΛΦΑ; vox Aegyptiaca. Grammaticus S. Germ. in Bekkeri Anecd. Gr. T. i. p. 381.: Ἀλφα τοῦτο ὑπὸ Φοινίκων βοδὸς κεφαλὴ ἐκαλεῖτο. Καὶ Μωϋσῆς δὲ ὁ νομοθέτης ὑπὸ Ἰουδαίων διὰ τὸ πολλοὺς ἔχειν ἀλφούς ἐν τῷ σώματι οὕτως ἐκαλεῖτο. Ἀλλὰ τοῦτο Νίκαρχος ὁ τοῦ Ἀμμωνίου ἐν τῷ περὶ Ἰουδαίων φλυαρεῖ. Ἀλφα δὲ ἐκαλεῖτο καὶ ὁ σὺς ὁ πλήξας τὸν Ἀδωνιν ἐκλήθη δὲ οὕτως ὑπὸ Ἀσβωτῶν τῶν ἐν Φοινίκη καλεῖται δὲ παρὰ Φοινίξιν ὁ ἀπηνῆς καὶ ἄγριος. Ἀλφα δὲ καλεῖται καὶ ὁ Ὅσιρις ὑπὸ Βιβλίων. Ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ ἐλάχιστον.

* ἈΠΑΘΗΝΑΙΟΙ. Hoc vocabulum, quod ignorat SCHNEIDERI Lexicon, legitur in J. Poll. iii. 58. Παμπόνηροι δὲ, οἱ Θεοπόμπου τοῦ συγγραφέως ἀπολῖται, καὶ ἀφέταιροι, καὶ ἀπαθηναῖοι. Vox παμπόνηρος in H. Steph. Thes. ἀμαρτύρως affertur. Sed extat et in Aristoph. Acharn. 854. Παύσων ὁ παμπόνηρος.

ἈΤΤΑΓΑΣ. “Ἀτταγᾶς [annon ἀττάγας, ut in Aeliani loco mox laudando?] Αἰγυπτίας memorat Clem. Alex. Pædagog. ii. 1. p. 140. c. inter alias aves. Utrum vero epitheton Αἰγυπτ. additum sit, ut pateat, id genus avium non nisi in Aegypto reperiri, atque adeo nomen quoque esse Aegyptium, an ut intelligatur, Aegyptias attagas præstantiores iis esse, quas Attici ἀτταγᾶς appellant, non ego dixerim.” Sturzius de Dial. Maced. et Alex. p. 88. = clxxiii. a. Si vir doctus Aeliani H. A. xv. 27. in memoriam revocasset, epitheton Αἰγυπτ. melius forte intellexisset: Λόγος τις λέγει τοὺς ὄρνιθας τοὺς ἀττάγας μετακριμισθέντας εἰς Αἴγυπτον ἐκ Λυδίας, καὶ ἀφεθέντας εἰς τὰς ὕλας, τὰ μὲν πρῶτα ὄρτυγος φωνὴν ἀφιέναι, κ. τ. λ. Vide nov. Thes. Gr. L. p. cccxxvii. b. Totum hoc caput, notante SCHNEIDERO, e Socrate ap. Athen. ix. 388. a. descriptum est. Per epitheton vero Αἰγυπτ. non intelligi potest, ut censet Sturzius, “id genus avium non nisi in Aegypto reperiri,” quod falsum esset, cum Aelianus et Socrates Lydiæ indigenam avem faciant, cum maxime in veterum deliciis esset attagen Ionicus, testibus Horatio Epod. ii. 53. Martiale xiii. 61. Plin. x. 68. cum, teste Aristoph. in Acharn. 873., frequentes essent in Bœotia (v. Athen. ix. 388. b. ibique Casauboni not.,) cum denique, teste Plinio l. c. “et in Gallia, Hispaniaque caperentur, et per Alpes etiam.” Quid est igitur de hac quæstione statuendum? alteram Sturzii sententiam amplectendam esse, quod, scilicet, Aegyptius attagen præstantior iis sit, quos Attici ἀτταγᾶς appellant? Imo attagen Ionicus, ut modo dixi, non Aegyptius, in veterum deliciis erat. At Clementi utpote Alexandrino, cui Aegyptius attagen melius Ionico sapere potuisset aliquid indulgendum est. Et quid impedit, quo minus credamus, posteriores gulæ deditos Aegyptias attagenas omnibus aliis prætulisse? Equidem suspicor Clementem Aegyptiæ attagenæ primas dedisse partes, propterea quod in Aegypto frequentissimæ essent.

ΓΙΓΓΛΑΡΟΣ. J. Poll. iv. 82., Νίγλαρος δὲ μικρός τις αὐλίσκος, Αἰγύπτιος, μοναυλῖα πρόσφορος. Sic edidit T. H. pro γίγγλαρος, et sic legitur in C. V. teste Kuhnio. Jungernianni Ms. habet, Νίγλαροι, “sed forte oculis aberrabat librarius ad id, quod mox segm. 83. (Μέλη δὲ αὐλημάτων, κρούματα, συρίγματα, τερετισμοὶ, τερετίσματα, νίγλαροι.)” Jungern. vide Jablonskii Gloss. vocc. Aeg. in nov. Thes. Gr. L. p. ccxiv. a. et Spicileg. Vocc. pro Aeg. habit. ibid. p. cccxxxviii. b. Sed his duabus rationibus ductus vulgatam lectionem γίγγλαρος textui restituendam esse omnino ceuseo:

1. Νίγλαρος non est μικρός τις αὐλίσκος, Αἰγύπτιος, μοναυλία φρόσφορος, teste enim ipso Polluce in segm. 83. l. c. νίγλαροι sunt modi tibiarum: Hesychio, Suidæ, et Photio sunt τερετίσματα, καὶ περὶ ἔργα κρούματα, et νίγλαρος Scholiastæ Aristoph. Acharn. 554. est τρέμα et μέλος μουσικὸν παρχαλευστικόν. V. loca in nov. *Thes. Gr. L.* laudata. Hanc expositionem confirmant versus in Aristoph. Acharn. 554., Αὐλῶν, κελευστῶν, νιγλάρων, συριγμάτων, Eupolidis versus apud Photium, Τοιαῦτα μέντοι νιγλαρεύων κρούματα, et Pherecratis versus ap. Plut. de Musica, p. 1142. a, ab ELMSLEIO ad Acharn. l. c. sic dispositi:

Εἰς τοὺς κυκλίους χοροὺς γὰρ εἰσηνέγκατο
 Ἐξαρμονίους, ὑπερβολαίους τ' ἀνοσίους,
 Καὶ νιγλάρους, ὥσπερ τε τὰς βαράνους ὄλην
 Καμπῶν [κάμπτων, Brunck:] με κατεμέστωσε.

Sed vir κριτικώτατος nos docere debuerat, quo sensu dixerit Pherecrates, Ἐξαρμονίους, ὑπερβολαίους, ἀνοσίους, ΚΑΙ νιγλάρους? Vide Brunckium in nov. *Thes. Gr. L.* l. c. laudatum.

2. Cum νίγλαρος nusquam alibi, quam in Pollucis loco ex Hemsterhusii emendatione, exponatur parva tibia, firmissimum argumentum, quo γίγγλαρος probetur esse tibiæ genus, tibi præbebit Anti-Atticista in ΒΕΚΚΕΡΙ Anecd. Gr. T. i. p. 88.: * ΓΙΓΓΛΑΡΙΑ οἱ ΑΥΛΗΤΑΙ λέγουσι γένος ὀργάνων. Voce γιγγλάριον augeri potest SCHNEIDERI Lex.

ZHTPEION. "Etym. M. p. 411, 41.: Εὗρηται δὲ καὶ διὰ τοῦ ἰ συνεσταλμένον, καὶ παρὰ Ἡροδότῃ "Αγ' αὐτὸν εἰς τὸ ζήτρειον. "Εστὶ δὲ χορίαμβον τὸ μέτρον. Hoc fragm. ad Herodem pertinere monuit Ruhnkenius in præclara illa Hist. Crit. Oratorum Gr. p. xcix. not. idemque scribit ζήτρειον-χωλιαμβικόν. Ex ultima Etymologi observatione de metro claudicante satis liquet, Ζήτρειον veram lectionem esse. Totam glossam sic refingo: Εὗρηται δὲ καὶ διὰ τοῦ ἰ συνεσταλμένον, καὶ [διὰ τῆς εἰ διφθόγγου] παρὰ Ἡρώδῃ "Αγ' αὐτὸν εἰς τὸ ζήτρειον. "Εστὶ δὲ χωλιαμβικόν τὸ μέτρον." *Mus. Cr. Cant.* vi. p. 311. In Herodis versu vulgatam lectionem ζήτρειον, ut vir doctus putat, esse sanam, nobis haud facile persuaderi potest. Etymologus enim, modo exemplis formæ ζήτρειον ex Eupolide et Theopompo citatis, subiungit: Εὗρηται δὲ καὶ διὰ τοῦ ἰ συνεσταλμένον, deinde, ut lectori fidem talis formæ faciat, locum ex Herode Iambographo affert: "Αγ' αὐτὸν εἰς τὸ ζήτρειον. Recte ergo Ruhnkenius ζήτρειον pro vulgato ζήτρειον reposuit.

* ἩΩ. Frustra Jablonskius, qui scripserit Ἡὼ in nominativo, Gloss. Voss. Aeg. p. ccxix. a., castigatur in nota ad Ind. nov. *Thes. Gr. L.*, sed proculdubio errat, Ἡὼ et in accusativo scribens. Proba sane est forma Ἡὼ in nom., quamvis H. Steph. et SCHNEIDERI Lexica de ea sileant. In loco Gregorii Cor. SCHAEFERUS edidit: Αἰτῶ Αἰτοῦν, Σαπφῶ Σαπφoῦν, Ἡὼ Ἡοῦν, Αἰδῶ Αἰδοῦν. Sic Ms. Voss. Sed cum in Codd. a. b. c. et August.

legatur altera forma 'Hw̄, 'Hoūn, cumque huic lectioni faveat analogia, (scribitur enim in nominativo Αητῶ, non Αητῷ: Σαπφῶ, non Σαπφῷ: 'Ιῶ, non 'Ιῷ: 'Απεστῶ, non 'Απεστῷ, Herod. ix. 84.: Εὔεστῶ, non Εὔεστῷ: 'Ηχῶ, non 'Ηχῷ: Εἰκῶ, non Εἰκῷ:) Gregorio Cor. 'Hw̄ et Αἰδῶ pro vulgatis 'Hw̄ et Αἰδῷ restituendum censemus. Teste autem Kænio, Meerm. habet 'Ιῶ 'Ιοῦν, quam lectionem probat ipse, quod 'Ιοῦν extat in Herodoto, p. 2, 22. nunquam ἰοῦν, sed vel ἦῶ, vel ἔω, nisi librariorum ea culpa sit; quibus debeatur etiam accusativus Αἰδῶ p. 5, 30. εἰκῶ p. 541, 80. Utrum tamen in Gregorio Cor. hanc vel illam lectionem sequaris, modo nominativum per 'Ιῶ vel 'Hw̄, (non per 'Ιῷ, vel 'Hw̄, quæ est accusativi forma,) scribendum teneamus, nihil omnino interest.

"ΙΣΙΣ. De voce * "Ισις, pro emplastri genere, silent Lexica H. Stephani et SCHNEIDERI. Sed vide Amaltheum Castello-Brunonianum s. Lex. Med. Patavii 1746. p. 461. ubi laudatur Galeni locus. Oribasius de Fract. ex Galeno xxi. in Cocchii Chirurg. Vet. p. 113.: 'Ολίγοι δέ τινες τῇ ἐναντιωτάτῃ, διὰ τῶν ἰσχυρότερον ξηραίνοντων φαρμάκων, ὡς καὶ τὴν "Ισιν ὀνομαζομένην εὐθέως ἐπιτιθέναι γυναικείῃ τῇ μήνιγγι, καὶ ταύτης ἔξωθεν ὀξύμελι.

ΜΥΡΑΠΠΙΑΙΑ τὰ, v. nov. Thes. Gr. L. p. ccclvii. a. vera lectio in Geoponicis est μυραπίδια, (sic * ἀγριοαπίδιον ap. Sotion. in Geopon. viii. 37. 3., 'Αχέρδου, τουτέστιν ἀγριοαπίδιου, v. BECKMANN. ad Aristot. Mirab. Auscult. p. 322. item Fr. Passow. tum in BECKII Actis Seminar. Reg. et Societ. Philol. Lips. V. i. p. 94. tum in Libro, cui titulus—Über Zweck, Anlage und Ergänzung Griechischer Wörterbücher, Berlin, 1812. 8. p. 75. qui in utroque loco ἀγριοαπίδιον pro ἀγριοαπίδιον habet,) in Plinio, Columella, et Celso * myrapia. SCHNEIDERUS ad Colum. T. iv. p. 618.:—"Myrapia ab odore dici monet Plin. xv. 16., igitur myrapia scripsi, cum vulgo myrappia legeretur; est enim myrapion a μῦρον, [imo μύρον, v. not. in Ind. nov. Thes. Gr. L. et nos infra,] unguentum, et ἄπιον, pirum."

ΜΤΡΙΝΗΣ. Chionis Epist. vi. p. 171.: 'Εχόμισέ μοι Φαίδιμος ταρίχου * 'Ροδιᾶν καὶ μέλιτος ἀμφορέας πέντε, καὶ τοῦ * Μερσίτου οἴνου κεράμια εἴκοσι. "Miror neminem ceterorum annotasse hoc vini genus aut loci nomen, unde ductum sit Μερσίτης. Si hoc silentium eo pertinet, ut ne extiterit quidem locus, haud dubie legendum est Μυρίτου, cum quia vinum hoc tale erat, ut nostrum opulentiae suæ, ut ait, admonere posset, tum dulce, quod habet xiii. epistola Platonis, quæ huic et x. nostri Epistolæ in reliquis etiam valde assentit. Ceterum de hoc vini genere conferri potest

* "Ροδιῶν φιαλῶν meminit Pollux vi. 96. et Hesych.: 'Ροδιάς ποτηρίου εἶδος. Cf. LENNER. ad Phalar. Ep. p. 305.—Video jam in defendenda lectione vulgata explicandaque loci sententia mecum consentire Jo. Meursium in Rhodo ii. 2. p. 81." Orellius. Vide Athen. xi. p. 496. e, f. 500. b. 502. e.

Salmasius Exerc. Plin. p. 500. f." Cober. "Μερσίτου habet quoque Cod. Aug. sed præplacet Coberi conjectura." Hoffm. Vide nov. *Thes. Gr. L.* p. ccclviii. et not. 1. item not. in Ind. ad v. *Μυρίνης*.

ΜΤΡΟΝ. In Pseudo-Herod. Epimer. Mss. scribitur *Μύρον*. V. nov. *Thes. Gr. L.* not. in Ind. ad v. *Μύρον*. Ps.-Herod. Epimer. Mss. : * *Μύρων, κύριον, κλίνεται Μύρωνος*.

ΝΕΙΛΟΣ. "Νεῖλος dictus primum Hercules, Ἑρακλῆς dictus, post liberatam Junonem a Peripnoo et Anonymo Gigantibus. Vid. Ptol. Heph. L. ii. Narr. Hist. apud Photium Cod. 190. p. 473." Locus est hic :—"Ὅτι Νεῖλος ὁ Ἑρακλῆς ἀπὸ γενέσεώς φασιν ἐκαλεῖτο· ἐπεὶ δ' Ἦραν ἔσωσεν, ἐπερχόμενον αὐτῇ ἀνελὼν τὸν Ἀνώνυμον καὶ Πυρίπνοον γίγαντα, ἐκείθεν διὰ τὸ ἀπαλαλκεῖν τῆς Ἦρας τὸν πόλεμον, μετέβαλε τὴν κλῆσιν." Godofr. Olearii Notæ ad Suidam p. 275. Lips. 1795. 8. * *Νεῖλος*, chirurgi nomen apud Theophanem Nonnum c. 46. "De Nilo eleganter egit J. H. Juglerus Bibliothecæ Ophthalmicæ Spec. prim. p. 40. : ejus meminit quoque Cælius Aurel. Morb. Acut. ii. 29." J. St. Bernard. Ps.-Herod. Epim. Mss. :—*Νεῖλος ποταμὸς*, * *Νεῖλειον* (sic) *ῥεῦμα*, καὶ *Νειλῶν*. Lege vel *Νειλεῖον*, vel potius * *Νεῖλιον*. In iisdem enim Epimerismis legi possunt hæc :—*Τὰ δὲ ἀπὸ ποταμῶν λήγοντα εἰς ὅς διὰ τοῦ ἰῶτα γράφονται, οἷον Νεῖλος, Νεῖλιος ῥοῦς*. Hoc adjectivo augeri possunt H. Steph. et SCHNEID. LEXX. V. nov. *Thes. Gr. L.* p. cccxviii. a. Forma *Νειλῶος*, de qua vide nov. *Thes. Gr. L.* p. cccxviii. b., legitur in Æliani H. A. xi. 10. *Νειλῶτις* extat in Inscr. apud Gori T. i. 373. Murator. p. clxxviii. 3. Jacobs. Anthol. T. xiii. p. 809., *Τῇδε Ἀλεξάνδρεια κόρη πρόπολος Διονύσου, Κιστοφόρος τε θεᾶς Νειλώτιδος Ἰσιδος ἀγνῆς*.

* *ὍΣΙΡΙΑΚΟΣ*, } *Ὅσιρείος* legitur in Zonaræ Lex. Vide nov. *Thes.*

* *ὍΣΙΠΕΙΟΣ*. } *Gr. L.* p. ccxlviii. b. Utrumque vocabulum, quo carent Lexica, reperitur in Plut. de Is. et Osir. p. 416. T. vii. ed. Reisk., *Αἱ τε τῶν ναῶν διαθέσεις, πῇ μὲν ἀνειμένων εἰς πτερὰ καὶ δρόμους ὑπαιθρίους καὶ καθαροὺς, πῇ δὲ κρυπτὰ καὶ σκοτία κατὰ γῆς ἐχόντων* * *στολιστήρια Θηβαίοις (ἐφηβείοις Reisk. legit), εἰκοτά καὶ σηκοῖς· οὐχ ἥκιστα δὲ ἡ τῶν Ὀσιρείων δόξα, πολλαχοῦ κεῖσθαι λεγομένου τοῦ σώματος* : p. 439., *Τοῖς δὲ Ὀσιριακοῖς καθωσιωμένην ἱεροῖς ἀπὸ πατρὸς καὶ μητρός*.

ΠΕΤΑΛΕΙΟΝ. Vox hæc, quæ in novo *Thes. Gr. L.* p. ccclx. b.—lxiv. not. 5. Hesychio restituitur, extat in Etym. M. p. 313, 33. e poeta incerto : *Ἀγχοῦση προσέοικεν ἀκανθῆν πετάλειον*. Voce * *πετάλωσις* carent Lexica. Etym. M. p. 69, 41. : *Ἀλοιμός· τὰς κρίσεις καὶ τὰς* * *ἐπαλείψεις ἀλοιμοὺς ἔλεγον. Σοφοκλῆς· Μαρίας ἀλοιμός ἡ ἐπάνω τῆς τοῦ θαλάμου γανώσεως ἐνείεσσα ἐπάλειψις, καθάπερ ανεῖ πετάλωσις οὕσα ἐν αὐτῷ*. "Μαρίας dictus ab urbe Cypri Mario, quæ postmodo appellata fuit Arsinoë," Brunck. in Lex. Soph. v. *Ἀλοιμός*.

ΠΡΟΦΗΤΑΙ. Theophanes Nonnus c. lxvi., Γραφῆναι δὲ χρὴ καὶ τὸ τοῦ προφήτου * ὑγροκολλούριον. “Procul dubio ex Ægypto in Græciam inigravit hæc compositio; nam sacerdotes apud Ægyptios prophetæ dicebantur, v. Apuleii Metam. ii. p. 47. et medicinæ periti erant. Heliodorus L. iii. p. 156. in primis Antinoi, ut docuit Casaub. ad Spatianum p. 137. unde collyrii hujus usum invaluisse suspicor tempore Hadriani, quem medicinæ studiosum fuisse testatur Caryophilus de Usu et Præstantia Thermarum, p. 35. Parabatur autem, ut hariolor, in fano Isidis, unde ægri illud petebant, ac in quo habitabant prophetæ et aliquando etiam peregrinantes. Colligo hoc ex historia quam de Achæmene refert Heliodorus, vii. p. 328. qui Isidis templum introibat ἐναλειψόμενος τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ, addit scriptor eroticus, Οἶσθα γὰρ ὡς φέρει τι μικρὸν ἔτι κακώσεως, et p. 333. Achæmenes de se, Ἀλλὰ ῥᾶον ἔχω μὲν καὶ διαβλέπω ‘σχεδὸν τοι λοιπὸν συνήθως. Cf. J. Langius Epist. Medic. i. Ep. 33. p. 135.” J. St. Bernard. Hæc verba scrupulum mihi injecerunt et quandam dubitationem, utrum per prophetas, quorum mentio frequens est in Append. ad Dioscoridem, Jablonskius in Pantheo Æg. et Gloss. vocc. Æg. recte intellexerit Ægyptiorum Sacerdotes, an potius amplectenda sit sententia vel Du-Cangii, qui Chymistas, vel Humelbergii, qui Medicæ Artis professores intelligendos censet. V. nov. *Thes. Gr. L.* p. cccclxxiii. b. et not. 13. item p. cccclxxiv. a. et not. 1. item not. in Ind. ad v. Προφήτης.

* **ΣΑΤΑΔΑΙ.** Vide Sturzium de Dial. Maced. et Alex. p. 46 = clxiv. b. qui in textu edidit Σαυᾶδαι, (et sic legitur in Albertina Hesychii Ed.) at in Ind. suo idem vir d. recte reposuit Σαυάδαι, ut Δευάδαι.

ΣΑΠΦΕΙΡΟΣ, ἡ, Lexica exhibent, (v. nov. *Thes. Gr. L.* p. cccxxxiv. b.), at ap. Mich. Psellum in Canticum Canticorum, (v. Meursii Opp. T. viii. p. 320.) legitur ὁ σάπφειρος :

“Ὁ λίθος γὰρ ὁ σάπφειρος τοῦτο σημαίνειν θέλει·

“Ἔστι γὰρ οὐρανοειδὴς οὗτος ὁ λίθος μόνος.

Sic ὁ, et ἡ σμάραγδος : v. nov. *Thes. Gr. L.* p. cclxxix. b.— lxxx. a. Lucianus De Domo T. iii. p. 198. : “Ὁ δὲ ταῦτ’ ἀφείς, ἐς τὴν Σαρδῶ, ἢ τὸν σμάραγδον, ἢ τὸν ὄρμον, ἢ τὸ ψέλλιον ἀποβλέπει. “Τὸν σμ. P. H. et J. plene : τ” aliæ per compendium, quod facile permutatur cum τὴν. Sed τὴν plenissime Fl. sine compendio. At genus nondum muto, quia et Latinis sæpe mascul. est. Vid. Burm. ad Ovid. Met. ii. 24.” J. F. Reitzius.

¹ “Διαβλίπω, Perspicio, vel Dispicio, Visu penetro,” H. St. Thes. Ind. Exemplum verbi hujusce in Thes. desideratum præbet Heliodori loc. in textu laudatus. Vide SCHNEID. Lex., ubi Plato et Plutarchus citantur.

* ΣΕΘΡΩΙΤΗΣ. Schol. Platon. p. 202.,¹ 'Εν τῷ Σεθρῳίτῃ νομῷ. V. not. in. Ind. p. v. ad nov. *Thes. Gr. L.* Strabo xvii. p. 1140. ed. FALCONERII: "Ἔστι δὲ καὶ νομὸς Σεθρεΐτης παρὰ τὴν λίμνην. Lege Σεθρῳίτης. Teste enim FALCONERIO ipso, "Scripti Σεθρῳίτης, Marg. Cas. sic Par. i. 5. Med. 3. 4. Bre. Esc. Mosc." Ptolemæo iv. 5. Σεθρῳίτου νομοῦ metropolis est Heraclea minor. "Stephanus Ethniconiaphus et Josephus urbem Sethron memorant; Strabo, Plinius, Ptolemæus, nomen Sethroiten; Ptolemæus vero Heracleopolim minorem vult fuisse metropolin Sethroïtici nomi." J. R. Forsterus ap. FALCONERIUM ad Strab. p. 1318. b. Sed quid est nomen urbis, cujus gentile sit Σεθρῳίτης? Certe a Σέθρον formari non potest Σεθρῳίτης, quod gentile a Σεθρῶν potius formandum est. At vox Σεθρῶν est nihili, quippe quod nullibi exstet. An legendum Σεθροΐτης? Equidem sic legendum censeo. At Σεθροΐτης a Σέθρον descendere non potest. In Σέθρον igitur corruptela latet, sed ulcus a magno Salmasio persanatum est. Steph. Byz.: Σέθρον πόλις Αἰγύπτου, ὁ πολίτης, Σεθροΐτης, ὡς Ἀρσενοΐτης, Ἀλέξανδρος τρίτῳ Αἰγυπτιακῶν. "Lege Σεθρόν," inquit Salmasius, "et ita legendum; gentile enim Σεθροΐτης a Σεθρόν, ut * Ἀρσενοΐτης ab Ἀρσινόνῃ: alioqui a Σέθρον venit Σεθρίτης." Salmasii correctionem non improbat L. Holstenius.

ΣΗΣΑΜΙΟΝ. Ps.-Herod. Epimer. Mss.: Σησάμιον, τὸ τρωγδ-

¹ Schol. Platon. p. 186.:—"Ὁ λωτὸς δένδρον ἐστὶν ἐν Λιβύῃ κατὰ Μίμφιν φυόμενον, ἐμέγεις, ἥλικον ἄπιος, ἢ μικρῷ ἑλαττων [ἑλαττον]· φύλλον δὲ ἐντομὰς ἔχον, καὶ πρινώδες, τὸ δὲ ξύλον μέλαν. Γένη δ' αὐτοῦ πλείω, διαφορὰς ἔχοντα τοὺς καρποὺς. Ὁ δὲ καρπὸς ὥσπερ κύαμος πεπαίνεται, ὥσπερ [οἱ] βότρυες, μεταβάλλων τὰς χροὰς. Φύεται δὲ κατὰ [καθάπερ] τὰ μύρτα παράλληλα πυκνὸς ἐν τοῖς βλαστοῖς. Ἐσθιόμενον [ἐσθιόμενος] δὲ ἐν τοῖς Λωτοφάγοις καλουμένοις γλυκύς ἐστι, καὶ ἡδύς, καὶ ἄσινής, καὶ ἔτι πρὸς τὰς κοιλίας ἀγαθός. ἡδίων δ' ὁ ἀπύρνος. Ποιοῦσι δὲ καὶ οἶνον ἐξ αὐτοῦ. Τὸ δένδρον δὲ καὶ πολὺ, καὶ πολὺκαρπον, καὶ παρὰ τὴν * Λωτοφαγίαν νήσον, ἀνέχουσιν [ἀπέχουσιν] τῆς χώρας, [idele punctum] μικρὸν [.] ὡσαύτως. Locus hic e Theophrasti H. P. iv. 4. sumits est. Verba vero in utroque scriptore pessime corrupta sunt, sed mutuam sibi faciem accendunt. In D. Heinsii et Bodæi editionibus sic leguntur:—"Ἔστι δὲ τοῦ λωτοῦ, τὸ μὲν ἴδιον γένος ἐμέγεις, ἥλικον ἄπιος, ἢ μικρὸν ἑλαττον, φύλλον δὲ ἐντομὰς ἔχον καὶ πρινώδες, τὸ μὲν ξύλον, μέλαν γένη δὲ αὐτοῦ πλείω, διαφορὰς ἔχοντα τοὺς καρποὺς· ὁ δὲ καρπὸς ἥλικος κύαμος, πεπαίνεται δὲ, ὥσπερ οἱ βότρυες, μεταβάλλων τὰς χροὰς. Φύεται δὲ καθάπερ τὰ μύρτα παράλληλα, πυκνὸς ἐπὶ τῶν βλαστῶν· ἐσθιόμενος δὲ ἐν τοῖς Λωτοφάγοις καλουμένοις, γλυκύς, ἡδύς, καὶ ἄσινής, καὶ ἔτι πρὸς τὴν κοιλίαν ἀγαθὸν [ἀγαθός]· ἡδίων δὲ [ὁ] ἀπύρνος· ἐστὶ γὰρ καὶ τοιοῦτον γένος. Ποιοῦσι δὲ καὶ οἶνον ἐξ αὐτοῦ. Πολὺ δὲ τὸ δένδρον καὶ πολὺκαρπον."—Ἔστι μὲν οὖν τῇ νήσῳ τῆς Λωτοφαγίας Φάριδι καλουμένη, πολὺς· αὕτῃ δὲ ἀπόκειται καὶ ἀπέχει [τῆς] χώρας] μικρὸν· οὐ μὲν ἐνταῦθα μόνον, ἀλλὰ πολλῶν πλείων ἐν τῇ ἡπείρῳ. Πλείστον γὰρ ὅλως ἐν τῇ Λιβύῃ καθάπερ εἴρηται, τοῦτο, καὶ ὁ παλιούρος ἐστίν. STACKHOUSIUS, vir doct. nihilque amic. male omisit τὸ ante ἴδιον. Idem καὶ posuit ante τὸ μὲν ξύλον, et pro πυκνὸς male edidit πυκνῶς. Sed recte reposuit ἐσθιόμενος et ἀγαθός pro vulgatis ἐσθιόμενον et ἀγαθόν: item ὁ ante ἀπύρνος. Idem pro ἐξ αὐτοῦ male dedit ἐξ αὐτῶν: item ἐν ante τῇ νήσῳ inseruit, ut legitur in Ald. et Basil. Edd. Item καὶ ἀπέχει ante μικρὸν omisit, post μικρὸν intelligendum censens ἀπὸ γῆς. Item pro τοῦτο καὶ legit πλησίον τούτου καί. Stephanns insulam Λωτοφόρον vocari tradit; Strabo Λωτοφάγτιν. Bodæus p. 326. a. e Strabone legendum conjicit τῇ νήσῳ τῇ Λωτοφαγιτίδι, sed nihil mutandum; Scholiastes enim Platonis habet, Παρὰ τὴν Λωτοφαγίαν νήσον.

μενον. Iterum: Σησαμούντες, τὰ γλυκύσματα. V. nov. *Thes. Gr. L.* p. cccxlii. a, b.

* ΣΙΝΔΟΝΙΣ. Jablonskio in Gloss. Vocc. Æg. est nomen viri proprium. V. nov. *Thes. Gr. L.* p. cclxiv. b. Sed pro Σινδόνις vel Jablonskius, vel Tewaterus, v. d., Gloss. istius editor, * Σινδόνιος scribere debuerat, ut legitur in Meursii Opp. T. viii. p. 542.

* ΣΚΕΠΙΝΟΣ. De pisce σκεπινὸς dicto v. nov. *Thes. Gr. L.* p. cccxxx. a. At in Oribasio de Fract. ex Archigene xxv. in Cocchii Chirurg. Vet. p. 118. ponitur pro adjectivo *opacus* significante: Κατάκλισις δὲ καὶ θεραπεία ἐν σκεπινῷ τόπῳ, ἀκάπῳ, ἀνόσμῳ.

* ΣΚΥΤΙΣ pro pellicula, cui amuletum illigatum stulti homines appendunt, vel potius pro amuleto ipso, ponitur apud Tatianum in nov. *Thes. Gr. L.* p. cclxv. not., nec erat causa, cur vox hoc sensu sumta corruptelæ suspicionem faceret. Theophanes Nonnus c. 36., Τὸ κινέρον δὲ λαβὼν περίαπτε δέρματι. "Interpres, Guinterium secutus, pro *cute* accepit, sed leg. ἐν δέρματι, in sacculo scorteo, vel in cingulo scorteo. J. Chrysostomus in Epist. 1. Pauli ad Thess. Serm. vi. p. 194., Οὐ ζώνην δερματίνην περὶ τὴν ὀσφύν ἔχουσι. Æschines Dial. ii. p. 78., Ἐν δερματίῳ σμικρῷ ἀποδίδεται, et p. 80." Tatianus Or. ad Græcos, p. 65., Οὐδὲ ὁ μεμηνὺς σκυτίδων ἐξαρτήμασι θεραπεύεται, ubi Contr. Gesnerus: 'Σκυτίδας interpretor pelliculas; his enim aut linteis amuleta quædam illigata stulti homines appendunt.' Pelle cervina ad id utebantur. Moschio de Morb. Mulier. c. 161., Ἐμβαλεῖς εἰς δέρμα ἐλάφου, καὶ ἐπίδησον τὸν βραχίονα αὐτῆς. Pellem anserinam laudat Eros sive Trotula de Passion. Mulier. c. ii. p. 244. Oribasius de Fract. i. p. 78., Προϋπέβαλλον τῷ τετραμένῳ κῶλῳ δέρμα, κ. τ. λ. ubi recte Cocchius vertit corium. Theophr. H. P. iii. 10. p. 158. de pinu, Καὶ λειότερον τὸν φλοιὸν καὶ εἰς τὰ δέρματα χρήσιμον. Plura vide apud Th. Reinesium Ep. 45. ad Casp. Hoffmannum p. 381." J. St. Bernard. Photius, p. 296.: Πέζα τὸ ἄκρον ἢ τὸ ἀπολλήγον τοῦ χιτῶνος, ὃ ἡμεῖς ὡς ἀνὴρ λέγομεν· πρότερον γὰρ ὑπὲρ τοῦ μὴ τρίβεσθαι δέρμα προβάτων * προσέριπτον. V. H. Steph. *Thes. Ind.* v. βόλλας.

* ΣΤΙΒΟΣ. Chrysostomus in Catena Ghislerii in Jerem. iv. 30.: Τὸ δὲ, Ἐὰν χρίσῃς στίβει, τὸ μέλαν λέγει, ὃ ἐπιχρῶννύει τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς εἰωθασιν αἱ γυναῖκες. Vox στίβος pro στίβῃ, quæ nusquam alibi legitur, in nov. *Thes. Gr. L.* p. ccl. a. suspecta est, jure optimo. Nam, ut θίβει in Exodi c. ii. 6. Vat. (v. nov. *Thes. Gr. L.* p. ccl. a.) legitur pro θίβῃ, quid mirum στίβει scriptum esse pro στίβῃ? Alexandrinos enim EI pro II scripsisse, docuit Sturzius de Ling. Maced. et Alex. p. 119=clxxix. De voce στίμμι vide Coray ad Heliodor. p. 355. Genitivus Στίμμεως legitur in Theo-

¹ Egregie fallitur doct. Bernardus. Æschines enim in utroque loco loquitur non de veste coriacea, sed de Carthaginiensi pecunia coriacea. V. FISCHER. not.

phane Nonno c.53. *Στίμμισμα*, quod in nov. *Thes. Gr. L.* p. cccxlix. b. ex uno Hesychio laudatur, extat in Critonis *Cosmeticis* ap. Fabric. *Biblioth. Gr. T.* xii. p. 690. ed. pr. Medicus ille primi libri argumenta hæc inter alia sibi suniserat, *Προσώπου * τιτανώματα*, *προσώπου ἐπίχριστα * λαμπρευτικά.*¹ *προσώπου καταπλάσματα λαμπρευτικά*, *ὄφρυον ἐπίχριστα*, *ὄφρων μελάσματα*, *ὄφθαλμῶν ἐπίχριστα*, *στιμμίσματα*, *ἐγχριστα.*² Verb. * *Στιβίζω* = (de quo v. nov. *Thes. Gr. L.* p. cccxlix. b.) legitur in Euseb. *H. E.* v. 18. p. 151. ed. 1695. A : *Προφήτης*, *εἰπέ μοι, βάπτεται; προφήτης στιβίζεται; προφήτης * φιλοκοσμεῖ;* Verb. * *Καθυποστιβίζω* Nicolao Damasceno p. 20. ed. Orelli restituit Vales. : *‘Ο * κατεξυρμένος τε καὶ καθυποστιβισμένος τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ, ψιμιθίῳ δὲ τὸ χρῶμα ἐναλειφόμενος.*

THBENNA. Ps.-Herod. *Epimer.* Mss.: *Τήβεννα* τὸ βασιλικὸν ἱμάτιον. *Τηβενός*, apud Salmas. ad Tertull. de Pallio p. 122. in nov. *Thes. Gr. L.* p. 39. not. 2. laudatum, typographi esse error videtur. Quod ad Pollucis locum ibidem citatum attinet, sanitati suæ optime restituit Adr. Heringa Obs. p. 29.:—“*J. Poll. vii. 61., Τὴν δὲ ὀνομαζομένην τήβεννον, καὶ κλεοβίνικον, ἐν Ἀργεὶ φορεῖν φασί· τηβεννίδα δ’ αὐτὴν καλεῖν ἀξιοῦσιν.* Pessime hæc corrupta sunt, sed facem accendit lucidissimam Ms. Falckenburgii, præferens : *Τήβεννον τὰς μὲν περὶ βήτων καὶ κλεόβιν εἰκόνας ἐν Ἀργεὶ φορεῖν φασί.* Unde sic rescribendus est totus locus : *Τὴν δὲ ὀνομαζομένην τήβεννον τὰς μὲν τῶν περὶ Βίτων καὶ Κλέοβιν εἰκόνας ἐν Ἀργεὶ φορεῖν φασί, Τεβενnum vero dictam Bitonis et Cleobis imagines Argis gestare ferunt.* Nota est Cleobis et Bitonis historia, et sagaciter Jungermannus Cleobis hic mentionem fieri conjecit. Vide ejus notas. Argis vero fuisse horum fratrum imagines, testatur Pausan. ii. 20. : *Πλησίον δὲ εἰσιν ἐπειργασμένοι λίθῳ Κλέοβις καὶ Βίτων, αὐτοὶ τε ἐλόντες τὴν ἄμαξαν, καὶ ἐπ’ αὐτῇ ἄγοντες τὴν μητέρα ἐς τὸ Ἑραῖον.* Has itaque imagines Tebenno vestitas fuisse, hinc discere licet.”

ΦΑΚΙΟΛΙΟΝ. H. Steph. v. *Ἡμιτύβιον* (v. nov. *Thes. Gr. L.* p. ccxix. a.) e Schol. Aristoph. *Plut.* 729. affert *φακιώλιον*, tanquam sic ibi legatur. Sed forte calami errore *φακιώλιον* pro *φακιόλιον* scripsit; in Hemsterhusii enim editione est *φακιόλιον*.

Thetfordiæ, Maii xviii. A. D. 1817.

¹ * *Λάμπρυσμα* extat in Etym. M. p. 232. 40.: *Γλαίνους· τὰ λαμπρύσματα τῶν περικεφαλαίων, οἷον ἄστρας.*

² Lexicographorum in gratiam vocabula duo in Critonis Fragmentis obvia, quibus carent H. St. *Thes. Gr. L.*, et Schneideri *Lex.* notabo. p. 690., *Ἐπίχριστα* πρὸς τὰς τῶν μασχαλῶν * συνιδρώσεις : p. 691., *Περὶ ἰντερῶν * κατολισθισιν.*

COLLATIO

CODICIS HARLEIANI 5674.

CUM ODYSSEA EDITIONIS ERNESTINÆ 1760.

No. VII.—(Continued from No. XXX. p. 295.)

253. ἀμφοιπολεύει (sic text.) ἀμφοιπολεύει marg.

255. ἐπέσπενεν text. In marg. γρ. ἐπέσπενεν.

256. ὅτ' ἦε text. ὅτε τ' ἦε marg.

258. οὐ γάρ τ' οἶω.

269. α κ'.

270. vulgatam habet MS. sine ulla varietate.

278. supra η in κούρης scriptum η et idem super οι in φίλοις. Deinde super ἔργα scriptum γρ. δῶρα.

281. παρείλκετο ex emend. Diphthongum habet unum scholion, simplicem vocalem alterum.

282. μενοίναϊ.

293. κλισίην γρ. κληῖσιν. Deinde ἐὺγνάμπτοις, sed λ supra ν, et οἰς mutatum in ης. In marg. ἐὺγνάμπτης.

295. ἐεζμένον primo scriptum, sed γ mox additum, quod omittit scholiastes.

302. ἄρα sine ἄμ'.

307. ἐπὶ δὲ γρ. περὶ δέ.

320. ἐνένιπε m. pr. sed ει pro ι ex recens. Infra 325. ει scriptum est super ι. Sed τ utrobique omittitur.

323. ἔχει.

329. θαρσαλέος text. In marg. θαρσαλέος πολλοῖσιν : ἀθετοῦνται τρεῖς ὡς ἐκ τῶν ἐξῆς μετατιθεμένοι.

330. αἰεὶ et ἐν super εἰ.

333. ἄλλος omittit.

334. κικοπῶς διὰ τοῦ φ κικοφῶς :

338. αὐτίς et θι supra τις.

343. εἰστήκειν text. In marg.

γρ. εἰστήκει et suprascri. ἔστηκεν.

344. γένοιτο ex emend.

349. γέλων δ' ἄρα τοῖσιν ἔτευξε. γρ. γέλων δ' ἰτάροισιν ἔτευχεν.

351. κελεύει γρ. ἀνώγει.

356. ἰθέλοῖς text. et schol.

357. δέ τοι et ἰς super οι.

359. ἐνθάκ' et δ' supra κ'.

360. εἴματα δ' et a manu pr. ποσὶν δ'.

370. γρ. ὥσπερ.

373. βῶλος a m. pr. χῶρος ex emend.

385. στείνοιτο, sed interpr. στενὰ γένοιτο. Deinde δι' ἐκ μεγάρουο ριανός :

389. θαρσαλέος et ὡς super ος.

391. μεταμάνια, sed λ supra ν.

401. πᾶσαι μετέθηκεν. ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐν ἡμῖν ἔθηκεν :

402. πτωχῶν.

408. εἴποτι.

410. θαρσαλέος et ὡς super ος.

413. δὴ τοι et ἰς super οι.

419. ριανὸς δὲ ἐν μεγάρουοισιν ἐκλον :

425. vulgatam servat.

427. βὰν δ'.

ΟΔΥΣΣ. Τ.

4. Scholiastes eadem habet quæ editus.

12. τε a m. pr. sed τ erasum.

20. γρ. ἴκετ' αὐτμή.

34. ἐν τισι γὰρ [γρ.] φόως.

38. ὑψος.

40. τοι pro τις.

54. ἤε.

65. ἐνέπατε.
 67. ὀπιπέουσιν.
 72. nunc οὐ λιπόω, sed quatuor literæ post rasuram. Videtur ergo fuisse τοι ἑνὶ πῶ.
 77. ἔοικεν pro ἔοι καί.
 78. καὶ μάλα.
 81. 82. ἀμπαν et τὴν, sed ex emend. utrumque.
 83. μήπως. In marg. ἦν πῶς ἢ γραφή· τὰ δὲ εἰκαιότερα μήπως·
 84. ἔλθοι.
 90. ἐνένιπεν.
 94. ἐνὶ μεγάρουσιν et suprapos. inter voces μ, ut liquidam in cæsura duplicandam moneat.
 113. τίκτη ex emend. In marg. πάντα οὐ μῆλα· ξιανὸς ἄσπετα.
 114. κακῶς δ' οἱ σὺν τῷ ῥ' γράφοντες εὐηργεσίας·
 116. ἀρίσταρχος μὴ δέ μοι·
 119. γοῶντά με.
 126. ἦεν.
 130. ἠθέτηται λ̄. ἐν δὲ τοῖς πλείστοις οὐδὲ ἔφερον. [Lege ἐφέροντο. Sed miram stragem edere voluere, quicunque tot versus ejecere. Præterea non coit sententia, triginta tantum versibus expulsis, sed duo præterea 160. 161. abigantur necesse est, et legamus λ̄ β̄. Præterea 136. et 139. agnoscit Aristarchus. Quare puto A mutandum in Δ, et suspectos tantum habendos 130—133.]
 136. ἀρίσταρχος ὀδυσοῖα ποθεύουσα. Legendum ὀδυσοῖ· Scholiastes ad II. Δ. 384. in Codice Townleiano: τυδῆ ὡς ἄλλ' ὀδυσοῖ ποθεύουσα· καὶ μηκιστῇ δ' ἔλε πούλυδάμας·—[II. O. 339. scriptum in Codice: ὀδυσοῖ et πολυδάμας.]
 139. ὑφαίνειν text. ἀρίσταρχος ὑφαίνειν.
 143. μεταμάνια.
 148. τοῖσι δ' ἐπειθετο.
 149. ἔνθα καί.
 150. ἀλλύεσκον διὰ τοῦ γ.
 155. ὁμόκλησαν.

158. μῆτιν ἐνθ' εὐρίσκω [voluit ἔθ' εὐ.]
 161. ὄλβον ὀπάξῃ, sed super ὄλβον est γρ. κῦδος et οἱ super η.
 163. παλαιφάγου pro var. lect. agnoscit scholion, vulgato simile. Tres lectiones memorat Hesychius, παλαιφάγου, παλαιφάτου, παλαιφύτου.
 174. ἐνένηκοντα.
 178. τηῖσι δ'·
 191. γὰρ οἱ.
 197. αἰείρας.
 206. καταχεύει.
 222. μοι et suprascr. γρ. οἱ.
 224. αὐτὰρ τοι ἔξω.
 226. τοι et suprascr. γρ. οἱ.
 233. κατασιγαλίοιο.
 243. αἰδοῖος, sed acutus supra circumflexum et ως super os.
 257. ἔμμεναι.
 260. 597. ὀνομαστόν.
 272. γρ. πολλὰ δ' ἄγει κειμήλια ὄνδε δόμονδε.
 278. ἔμβαλε ex emend. ejusdem manus.
 288. ἀποσπένδων et γρ. ἐπὶ super ἀπό.
 295. ὅσα οἱ, sed τ præfixum, nescio an ab eadem manu.
 314. τεύξῃ· ἐπεὶ οὔτι σ. εἴσ' ἐνὶ οἴκῳ. In marg. γρ. τεύξαι et pro οὔτι est οὐ τοῖσι [quæ sane vera est lectio, librar is crasin hanc, ἐπεὶ οὐ, ignorantibus.]
 305. τῇ pro τοι et interpr. οὔτως.
 320. ἠῶθι.
 326. γρ. ἐχέφρονα.
 327. αἶκιν et εἴ super αἴ.
 329. τ' mittit.
 334. πολλοὶ τε μιν.
 343. ἐπίηρ' ἀνά, sed ἐπιήρανα Hesychius in v. ubi recte viri docti ἦ delevere, neque agnoscit MS.
 347. τέτληκε τόσσα text. sed δὴ additum inter lineas a manu secunda.
 348. τῇδε δ' ἂν οὐ.
 358. σοῖο.

367. τῷδ' ex emend. et ἰδίδου primo, sed σ additum ex emend.

369. νῦν δέ τοι ὦλω.

372. καθεψύωντο.

374. ἀνωγε.

394. παρηγσὸν (δ videtur erasum,) sed cum σ simplici 411. 432. 466.

397. μυρία a manu prima.

401. γε. ἀντίκλεια.

403. ὅτι κε θεῖο text. γε. ὅτι θεῖς.

407. τῶδ'.

408. ἀναχθόμενα βοτιάνευρα. (sic) γε. ἀνὰ χθόνα πολυβότειραν.

423. ἐρύσαντό τε μοίρας γε. πάντα.

444. τῶν δ'.

445. ἀπάγοντες et ἐ super α.

455. φίλοι omittit.

461. φίλως.

475. ἀμφιφάσθαι ex emend.

487. pro τὸ δὲ καὶ MS. καί μιν et κεν supra μιν.

490. ἐνί. Deinde κτείνω μί et suprascr. γε. τείναιμι.

493. οὐδ', sed fortasse ex emend.

509. ἐγών.

510. ἔσσεται ἡδέος.

515. ἐπεί.

516. ἐν ἡλέκτρῳ

517. μελεδῶνες a manu recentiori.

518. Hic genitivus in scholiis infra ad γ. 66. scribitur πανδάρεια.

520. δένδρεον Æliani editiones, sed δένδρων codex Mediceus.

521. τροπῶσα male; cetera omnino, ut vulgantur. Sed aliam lectionem ministrat Scholiastes Leidensis apud Valckenarium ad Ammon. p. 243. ubi schol. referendum erat ad Il. I. 496. non 308. κίχρηται τῷ τροπῶ [l. τροπῶ] καὶ ἐπὶ φωνῆς καὶ ἐπὶ μελῶν ἐξαλλαγῆς· καὶ ὡς ἐπὶ τῆς ἀηδόνης· [dele καὶ. ὡς omittit Harl.] ἥτε θαμὰ τροπῶσα χεῖρ μελιηδέα γῆρυν, αἰοιδῆν. Videntur duæ lectiones in unum confusæ: μελιηδέα γῆρυν et μελιγῆ-

ρυν αἰοιδῆν. At vero idem scholion exstat in Harl. ad primum *Odysseæ* versum, et nullam varietatem præbet, nisi τροπῶσα.

526. ὑψίρεφες ex emend.

529. ἐνὶ μεγάροισι et μ suprapositum inter voces. Deinde ἀπειρίσια ἔδνα, sed additum alterum ε.

534. γε. ἀσχάλλαν.

539. πᾶσι δὲ κατ' αὐχένος ἤξει.

547. ὅτι pro ὅ τοι.

555. κρίνασθαι sine præpositione.

562. ψευστάων etiam habent Photius et Suidas v. Τυφλῶν ὀνειρων.

565. οἳ γ' γ' ἐλεφαίρονται. In marg. οἳ τ' ἐλεφεύρονται. Ex quatuor lectionibus, οἳ γ', οἳ δ', οἳ ε', et οἳ τ', omnino probanda est tertia, quæ usurpatur eodem modo 567. et tum οἳ μὲν et οἳ δὲ clarius opponuntur.

578. γε. διοίστευσί.

586. τούτοις τῷδε et in marg. γε. ποτί.

590. οὐκὲ μοι.

598. λέξαι, unde librarii de metro anxii, pro captu suo, vel λέξω vel λέξαι efficerent.

ΟΔΥΣΣ. γ.

3. ἱερεύεσκον.

7. πάρος περ et γε supra περ.

10. μερμήριζε.

16. ὧς ἄρα τοῦ.

19. ὅτε μοι.

23. interpr. ἐν πειθοῖ. Initio versus vulgatam servant Harl. et Hesychius v. πείση. Sed Scholiastes ad Il. κ. 290. in Codice Wetsteniano apud Valckenær. ad Schol. in Euripidis Phoeniss. 271. n. 71. p. 643. habet τῷ δ' ἄρα τ' ἐπεισα, unde is τῷ δ' ἄρα τ' aut τῷ δὲ καλ'. In Codice Veneto, τῷ δ' ἄρ' ἐν. Sed in Townleiano, τῷ δ' ἄρ' ἔτ' ἐν π. quæ certe probabilis lectio.

27. αἰόλλη, (sic). Apollonius αἰ-
ολλη.
41. πρὸς δέ τοι, sed τῖ supra τοι.
43. τὰ σε.
55. αὐτὴ δ' αὖτ' ex emend. et
ante 53. ἀποδύσαι ex emend.
67. τοῖσι et suprascr. γε. τῇσι.
86. ἀμφικαλύψει.
97. εὗξατο.
100. φῆμιν primo scriptum, sed
circumflexus super acutum positus
et ιν super ην. Mox 105. φῆμιν
sine ulla varietate.
107. τῇσιν δώδεκα.
108. ἀλείφατα.
109. πυρὸν et suprascr. σῖτον.
110. γὰρ τέτυκτο, sed δ' ἐ super
γάρ.
126. ὑπὸ.
129. πῶς τὲν ξείνον.
131. ἐμή.
134. γε. πηνελόπεια.
136. πίνει e! suprascr. ἔπινε.
141. ἔθελε sine ἐν.
143. ἔδραθ' ἐνὶ π.
150. ἐν τε θρόνοισιν.
153. δέπα'.
159. κατὰ δάματ'.
160. ἐκ δ' ἦλθον δρηστήρες. In
marg. γε. ἐς.
161. ται δέ.
170. ἀτάσθαλα.
176. κατέδησεν.
182. αἰτίζοις et εις super οἷς.
Mox in marg. γε. καὶ ἄλλοι.
187. γε. πορθμῆες γὰρ αὐτούς γε.
188. εἰσαφίκηται, sed οἷτο super
ηται.
196. ἐπικλώσονται.
199. ὥσπερ.
200. ἀτὰρ μὲν νῦν γε et υ post α
in ἄταρ et γε. ἐμὶ supra μὲν. Dein-
de πολέεσι.
209. ἐπὶ et suprascr. γε. ἐνί.
211. ἄλλω, sed ex rasura.
212. ὑποσταχύοιτο.
219. αὐτοῖσι et 221. ἄλλοτρίῃσι.
220. τόδε.
228. ὅτι pro ὅ τοι.
230. ξενίῃ τε τράπεζα et in m. γε.
ὑπατος καὶ ἄριστος.
231. ἰστίη τ'.
237. γνοίης χ'.
252. ἐν δέ τε οἶνον. In marg. γε.
ἐν δέ τε (sic.)
255. νοχόει a manu prima,
, additum e recensione.
259. καταθείς suprascr. pro var.
lect. καταθείς etiam Apollonius
Lexico v. αἰεκέλιον.
σ
265. ὀδυσηὸς θείοιο ἐμοὶ δ'.
266. ἐνιπῆς et suprascr. ἀπειλῆς.
267. χειρῶν.
273. τῷ κέ μιν.
289. θεσπεσίοισι pro πατρὸς ἰοῖο.
302. σαρδάνιον δ' ἄρα et suprascr.
γε. μάλα.
310. δ' ἔτι nunc scriptum, sed
non, opinor, ab ipsa prima manu.
315. εἰ δὴ μή μ' αὐτόν.
324. μήτε τι.
327. ἀμφοτέρωσιν.
337. κομίζη.
342. δίδωμι
346. γέλω. Sic in Iliad. E. 416.
quidam legebant ἰχῶ per apoco-
pen pro ἰχῶρα.
347. γελῶν.
362. ἔσκει et εις super ει.
368. τὸ μὲν.
369. γε. ἀνδρῶν οἱ κατὰ δάματ'
ὀδυσηὸς θείοιο.
374. γε. θαύμαζον.
378. ἔργον.
380. μαντεύσασθαι γε. μαντεύεσθαι.
381. ἀλλ' εἴ μοι τί πίθοιο.
383. τοι. [Ergo alius T. Bent-
leii MS.]
390. γελῶντες a manu pr. γελῶ-
οντες ex emend.

ACCOUNT OF LITERARY FORGERIES.

From ROBERTSON on the Parian Chronicle.

THE world has been often imposed upon by spurious books and inscriptions.

Bishop Stillingfleet, having occasion to question the authenticity of a book, entitled, *Scotorum Antiquitates*, ascribed by Hector Boethius to one Veremundus, a Spaniard,¹ makes the following remarks, which are applicable to the present subject.

“It is well known that it was no unusual thing in that age [about the beginning of the sixteenth century] to publish books under the names of ancient authors—For, about that time, men began to be inquisitive into matters of antiquity; and therefore some, who had more learning, and better inventions than others, set themselves to work, to gratify the curiosity of those, who longed to see something of the antiquities of their own country. And such things were so eagerly and implicitly received by less judicious persons, that it proved no easy matter to convince them of the imposture.”²

The celebrated Dr. Bentley makes the following observations to the same effect.

“To forge and counterfeit books, and father them upon great names, has been a practice almost as old as letters. But it was then most of all in fashion, when the kings of Pergamus and Alexandria,³ rivalling one another in the magnificence and copiousness of their libraries, gave great rates for any treatises, that carried the names of celebrated authors; which was an invitation to the scribes and copiers of those times, to enhance the price of their wares, by ascribing them to men of fame and reputation; and to suppress the true names, that would have yielded less money. And now and then even an author, who wrote for bread, and made a traffic of his labours, would purposely conceal himself, and personate some old writer of eminent note; giving the title and credit of his works to the dead, that he himself might the better live by them. But what was then done chiefly for lucre, was afterwards done out

¹ Vermundus is said to have lived about the year 1090. Fabric. Bibl. Med. & Inf. Lat. Hector Boethius flourished in 1526. Gesner. Or, in 1510. König. Bibl.

² Stillingfleet, Orig. Brit. pref. p. 50.

³ Galen. in Hippoc. de Naturâ hominis, com. ii. p. 17. edit. Basil.

of glory and affectation, as an exercise of style, and an ostentation of wit. In this the tribe of the sophists are principally concerned; in whose schools it was the ordinary task to compose *ἱθοποιίας*,¹ to make speeches, and write letters in the name and character of some hero, or great commander, or philosopher: *Τίνας ἀν εἶποι λόγους*, “What would Achilles, Medea, or Alexander say in such or such circumstances?” Thus Ovid, we see, who was bred up in that way, wrote love-letters in the names of Penelope, and the rest. It is true, they came abroad under his own name; because they were written in Latin and in verse, and so had no colour or pretence to be the originals of the Grecian ladies. But some of the Greek sophists had the success and satisfaction to see their essays, in that kind, pass with some readers for the genuine works of those they endeavoured to express. This, no doubt, was great content and joy to them; being as full a testimony of their skill in imitation, as the birds gave to the painter, when they pecked at his grapes. One of them² indeed has dealt ingenuously, and confessed, that he feigned the answers to Brutus, only as a trial of skill; but most of them took the other way, and, concealing their own names, put off their copies for originals; preferring that silent pride and fraudulent pleasure, though it was to die with them, before an honest commendation from posterity for being good imitators. And to speak freely, the greatest part of mankind are so easily imposed on in this way, that there is too great an invitation to put the trick upon them.”³

If we were to take a general view of the republic of letters, we should be astonished at the number of supposititious books, which have been imposed upon the world by knaves and cheats.

Jamblicus, on the testimony of Seleucus, informs us, that Hermes Trismegistus was the author of 20,000 books; and, on the authority of Manetho, 36,525.⁴ There are many volumes now

¹ Allocutio, quæ a Græcis *ἱθοποιία* dicitur, est imitatio sermonis ad mores et suppositas personas accommodata: ut, quibus verbis uti potuisset Andromache, Hectore mortuo. Priscian. See the *Ethopœia* of Severus the sophist, at the end of the *Rhetores Selecti*, published by Gale.

² Mithridates.—The publication, to which Dr. Bentley alludes, consists of 35 epistles, supposed to have been written by M. Brutus; and the same number of answers, with a preface, by Mithridates, to king Mithridates his cousin.—Epistolæ, quas nobis reliquit nescio quis, Bruti nomine, nomine Phalaridis, nomine Senecæ et Pauli, quid aliud censeri possunt quàm DECLAMATIONULÆ? Erasim. Ep. l. i. 1. Fabric. Bibl. Græc. l. ii. c. 10. vol. i. p. 414.

³ Bent. Dissert. upon Phal. p. 6. edit. 1777.

⁴ Jamb. de Myst. sect. viii. c. i.—Julius Firmicus also ascribes 20,000 volumes to Hermes. Mercurius Ægyptius conscripserat viginti millia voluminum de variis substantiis & principiis, & potestatum ordinibus cœlestium. Mathes. l. ii.

extant under his name; but not one of them is genuine. Two of the most considerable, the *Pœmander*, and the dialogue entitled *Asclepius*, are metaphysical rhapsodies, containing a medley of Christian, Platonic, and Egyptian doctrines, without either taste or consistency; and appear to have been written since the commencement of Christianity.¹

Twenty or thirty thousand books, produced by one author! The very idea shocks all human credibility; and, if ever such a number really existed, under the name of *Hermes*, we may fairly conclude, that the greatest part of them were forgeries.²

The two books of Egyptian hieroglyphics, which are ascribed to *Horus Apollo*, or *Horapollo*, and said to have been translated out of the Egyptian language into Greek by one *Philippus*, are the spurious production of some Greek sophist.

An epic poem, called the *Argonautics*, eighty-six hymns, and other pieces, pass under the name of *Orpheus*, the celebrated Thracian, who lived at the time of the Argonautic expedition.³ But they are evidently supposititious. As the ancients have told us that *Orpheus* could make wild beasts, trees, rocks, and rivers listen to his music, it is no wonder that certain poets in later ages assumed his character, and sent their productions into the world under his auspices. His name was an incomparable passport and recommendation to the writings of obscure bards. Aristotle asserted, that no such poet as *Orpheus* ever existed: "*Orpheum poetam docet Aristoteles nunquam fuisse.*"⁴ *Cicero* seems to agree with

¹ Casaubon calls the *Pœmander*, *semichristiani merum figmentum*, and gives sufficient reasons for his opinion. *Exercit. in Baron. Annal. num. 18. p. 55. Stillingfl. Orig. Sacrae, b. ii. c. 2.* *Asclepius* is in the same style, and seems to be a production of the same brain.

² *Patricius* assigns some very probable reasons for the ascription of all these books to *Hermes*.—*Quòd fuerit*, says he, in more antiquissimorum hominum, ut si cui libro auctoritatem accedere cuperent, vel *Dei alicujus*, ut *Ægyptii Mercurii*, vel hominis alicujus insignis, nomine ornarent, reverentiâ scilicet quâdam; vel etiam quòd vendibiliorem eo nomine sperarent fore; vel quòd sætui proprio, alieni nominis, quàm sui insignibus, gratiam majorem consequi sperarent ac immortalitatem; vel postremo, quòd reverà author libri ignoraretur, viderenturque in eo contenta dogmata non nisi magni viri esse; aut etiam negligentia quâdam, ac nullâ librorum expensione, alicujus eos viri celebris nomine insigniverunt. *Patric. Discuss. Peripat. tom. i. l. 3. p. 29. Vid. Galen. de Simpl. Medic. Facul. l. vi.*

³ *Suidas* says, a little extravagantly, that *Orpheus* lived "eleven generations before the Trojan war." But who shall pretend to ascertain the age of a poet, who is said to have been the son of *Apollo* and *Calliope*, and to have gone down to the regions of *Pluto* to fetch his wife? *Saxius* places him 1255 years before Christ.

⁴ *Cic. de Nat. Deor. l. i. § 107.*

Aristotle; and Vossius, Huetius, and others, maintain the same opinion.¹

But, without calling his existence in question, we may be fully assured, that none of his works are now remaining.

Musæus is said to have been the son, or the disciple of Orpheus.² The poem of Hero and Leander, which is published under his name, is probably the work of some Greek poet in the fifth or sixth century.³ It is observed, that he has borrowed very largely from the Dionysiaca of Nonnus.⁴ We often meet with the name of Musæus; but never find the least intimation of this poem, in any ancient writer. Tzetzes, I believe, is the first, who expressly mentions it.⁵ It was first printed in 1486.

We have a history, *De Excidio Trojæ*, of the Destruction of Troy, under the name of Dares Phrygius. In an epistle prefixed, it is pretended, that this Dares was present at the siege; that his manuscript was discovered at Athens many years afterwards, by C. Nepos, and translated by him into Latin.

But the inelegant, not to say, the despicable style in which it is

¹ Puto enim, triumviros istos poëseos, Orphea, Musæum, Linum, non fuisse; sed esse nomina ab antiquâ Phœnicum linguâ, quâ usi Cadmus et aliquandiu posteri. Voss. de Art. Poet. c. 13. p. 78. Huet. Dem. Evang. prop. iv. c. 8. § 19. p. 184. edit. 1680.—Vid. Suid. in v. Ὀρφεύς, “where,” says Dr. Bentley, “there is an account of half a score of such counterfeit writers.” Dissert. on Phal. p. 10. Ælian. Var. Hist. l. viii. c. 6. Diog. Laert. in proëm. § 5. Pliny places Orpheus in the list of magicians. Nat. Hist. l. xxx. c. 1.

Some writers pretend, that the Argonautics, the hymns, and other poetical pieces, which are extant under the name of Orpheus, are the works of Onomacritus, who lived about 520 years before the Christian æra.—This notion may be as groundless as the other.

² Diod. Sic. l. iv. p. 232. Suidas.

³ Musæum hunc recentiore circumcirca tempora Coluthi, Tryphiodori, Joannis Gazæi, Nonni, Christodori, Leonis Magistri, multis scilicet post Christum natum annis, floruisse certissimum est, præter orationis structuram, ipso operis titulo, ubi se grammaticum appellat, Μουσίου τοῦ γραμματικοῦ τὰ καθ’ Ἡρώ καὶ Λέανδρον; et istiusmodi inscriptionem in pluribus me legisse memini manuscriptis codicibus. Allat. de Patriâ Homeri, c. 4. p. 75.

Ad quæso, nisi monitus criticorum vaticiniis, Musæo, Orpheo, Lino, Phocylidi, et aliis INNUMERIS, tum Pelasgis, tum Romanis, poemata spuria multa, et illegitima, assignata fuisse, hodieque assignari INSULSE, ut veteri Phocylidi quæ supersunt, Musæo de Herone et Leandro poema, scire quis unquam potuisset? Maussaci Dissert. Crit. de Harpocrate, p. 399. edit. 1683.

If we may depend on the authority of Josephus and Sextus Empiricus, there were no writings remaining, in their days, among the Greeks, of higher antiquity, than the poems of Homer. See notes to chap. ix. p. 127.

⁴ Paræus in Musæum.

⁵ Tzet. Chil. ii. hist. 38. v. 435.—Tzetzes flourished about the year 1176.

written, as well as many other circumstances, clearly demonstrate the falsity of these pretences.

There is another production of the same character, in six books, *De Bello Trojano*, of the Trojan War, bearing the name of *Dic-tys Cretensis*. In the preface, and an epistle, which accompanies this work, it is asserted, that the author attended Idomeneus to the siege of Troy, and wrote the history of that expedition in the Greek language, but in Phœnician characters; that his work was buried with him, at his own request, in a coffer made of pewter or tin; that, in consequence of an earthquake, the coffer was discovered, in the reign of Nero; and some time afterwards translated into Latin, by one Q. Septimius Romanus.

This legendary tale, and some others, which I shall have occasion to mention, are evidently formed upon the old story of king Numa,¹ who is said to have ordered that his books should be safely enclosed in a stone chest, and buried by his side. After they had lain in the ground 490 years,² they were, it seems, accidentally discovered, and appeared as fresh, as if they had been newly written!³ Some people imagined, they were kept in this EXCELLENT PRESERVATION by a miracle.⁴ Others, probably, a little more sagacious than the rest, upon observing the Egyptian papyrus, of which they were made, the freshness of the writing, and the contents, looked upon them as forgeries. It is however agreed on all hands, that Q. Petilius, the prætor, by a decree of the senate, caused them to be publicly burnt; which certainly would not have been suffered, if there had been any reason to believe that they were the genuine remains of the religious Numa.⁵

A small volume, containing 148 epistles, has been repeatedly published under the name and character of Phalaris, tyrant of Agrigentum. In the year 1695, the Hon. Mr. Boyle printed a new edition of these Epistles, which occasioned a memorable controversy between him and Dr. Bentley. The latter, in a dissertation,⁶

¹ Varro *Fragm.* p. 51. *Liv.* l. xl. c. 29. *Plin.* l. xiii. c. 13. *Plut.* v. *Nu-mæ*, p. 74. *Val. Max.* l. i. c. i. § 12. *Lactan.* l. i. c. 22. *Aur. Vict.* c. 3.

² Numa died bef. Chr. 671.; and his books were found in the year 181. *Corsin.* *Plin.* loc. cit.

³ Non integros modò, sed recentissimâ specie. *Liv.* loc. cit.

⁴ Majore miraculo, quòd tot infossi duraverint annis. *Plin.* loc. cit.

⁵ Inclyta justitia religioque Numæ Pompillii erant. *Liv.* l. i. c. 18.

⁶ Bentley's Dissertation was printed at the end of the second edition of Mr. Wotton's *Reflections on ancient and modern Learning*, in 1697. The Examination of Bentley's Dissertation, by the Hon. Mr. Boyle, appeared about nine months afterwards; and a second edition of it, before the end of the year 1698. This drew from Dr. Bentley another edition of his Dissertation, in 1699, with a preface, and very large additions, in answer to the examiner.

well known to the learned, considers the chronology, the language, the contents, and the first appearance of these epistles; and incontestably proves that they are the spurious productions of some sophist, who lived in a much later age than the real Phalaris. To this Dissertation the learned author has subjoined some critical remarks on the Epistles of Themistocles,¹ Socrates, and Euripides; and on Æsop's Fables, showing that they are likewise supposititious.

Some of the dialogues, which are published among the works of Plato, were written by other authors. Erasmus thinks this so very evident, that, he who does not perceive it, must have no discernment.²

Diogenes Laertius observes, that the dialogues, entitled, Eryxias, Acephalus or Sisyphus, Axiochus, and Demodocus, are undoubtedly spurious.³ The Definitions, the Dialogue on Virtue, and that on Justice, are generally placed in the same class.⁴ The Epinomis has been ascribed to Philippus Opuntius, one of Plato's disciples;⁵ the second Alcibiades to Xenophon,⁶ and Phædon to Panætius.⁷

¹ The very judicious and accurate Corsini deduces a new argument against the authenticity of the epistles, ascribed to Themistocles, from a mistake, which the author has made in the thirteenth epistle, concerning the Corinthian month Panemus. Fast. Attic. Dissert. iii. § 22.

² Sunt aliquot inter Platonicos dialogos, quos nemo non sentit supposititious esse, nisi qui nihil omninò sentit animo. Erasmi Epist. ad tom. iv. Hieron. Op. p. 5.

³ Diog. Laert. l. iii. c. 62.

Eryxias is ascribed to Æschines, the Socratic philosopher. Suidas in v. *Αἰσχίνης*.

Sisyphus or Acephalus, to Æschines. Diog. Laert. l. ii. § 60. iii. § 62. Suid. loc. cit.

Axiochus to Æschines. Diog. Laert. Harpoc. in v. *Ἀξίωχος*. Suidas loc. cit. et in v. *Ἀξίωχος*.

Demodocus: *ἢ δὲ τοῦ Πλάτωνος τὸ σύγγραμμα*, si modò est opus Platonis. Clem. Alex. Strom. l. i. p. 315.

⁴ The *ὁρίαι*, or Definitions, are supposed to have been written by Speusippus. Diog. Laert. l. iv. § 5. Lambecii Comment. de Biblioth. Cæsar. l. vii. p. 137.

The Dialogue on Virtue is placed by Suidas among the works of Æschines.

⁵ Diog. Laert. l. iii. § 37.

⁶ Athen. l. xi. p. 506.

⁷ Menagii Observ. in Diog. Laert. l. iii. § 62. Vid. Fabric. Bibl. Græc. vol. ii. p. 9. Placcii Theatrum Pseudonymorum. p. 511. Patric. Discuss. Peripat. tom. i. l. 3.

* * In what relates to the want of authenticity, in some of Plato's Dialogues, and the works of others, I give the sentiments of learned writers, without any design to adopt or maintain their opinions, when they are not confirmed by unquestionable evidence.

Laertius reckons up "near 400 books," which, he says, were undoubtedly written by Aristotle.¹ Patricius has collected the titles of 747, which have been ascribed to that philosopher.² But many of these pieces, as he has sufficiently proved, are supposititious. Galen and Ammonius give us an anecdote, which accounts for this inundation of spurious publications, under the name of Aristotle.

"When the Attali and the Ptolemies," says Galen, "were rivaling one another in forming and enriching their respective libraries, the knavery of forging books and titles began [to be a common practice.] For, in order to get money, many artful schemers prefixed the names of celebrated authors to their manuscripts, and, under such fictitious characters, sold them to those princes."³

Ammonius relates the same story. "It is reported," says he, "that Ptolemy Philadelphus, being desirous of collecting the works of Aristotle, as indeed he was of collecting all sorts of books, gave rewards to those, who brought him any treatise of that philosopher. Some therefore, with a design to make an advantage of his liberality, affixed the name of Aristotle to the compositions of other authors."⁴

On this account, it is almost impossible for us to know, which are the genuine productions of Aristotle.

The treatise on Elocution, usually ascribed to Demetrius Phalereus, though not unworthy of his character, is most probably the work of some other Demetrius, or some rhetorician of a later age, who has assumed his name.⁵

¹ Ἄ τὸν ἀριθμὸν ἐγγυὲς ἦκει τετρακοσίων, quæ ad quadringentorum numerum ferè perveniunt. Diog. Laert. l. v. § 34.

² Si hi, ex variis authoribus, atque ipso Aristotele, collecti, libri triginta septem, reliquis a Laertio enumeratis, atque iis, qui extant, addantur, septingentorum quadraginta septem numerum adimplebunt. Patric. Discuss. Peripat. l. ii. p. 18.—The same books were probably mentioned by different authors, under different titles. This circumstance seems to have deceived many writers, who have enumerated the works of the ancients.

³ Galen. in Hippoc. de Nat. Hom. com. ii. p. 17.

⁴ Πτολεμαῖον τὸν Φιλαδέλφον πάνυ σπουδανέναι φασὶ περὶ τὰ Ἀριστοτελικά συγγράμματα, ὥς καὶ περὶ τὰ λοιπὰ, καὶ χρήματα δίδοναι τοῖς προσφέρουσιν αὐτῷ βιβλους τοῦ φιλοσόφου· ὅθεν τινὲς χρηματίσασθαι βουλόμενοι, ἐπιγράφοντες συγγράμματα τῷ τοῦ φιλοσόφου ὀνόματι, προσῆγον. Aiant Ptolemæum Philadelphum incensum studio fuisse circa Aristotelis libros, sicuti et circa alios, et munera dedisse iis, qui sibi adferrent libros philosophi. Quare quidam ditari inde volentes, inscripserunt libros nomine philosophi, eique detulerunt. Ammon. Com. in Arist. Categ. p. 10.

⁵ The Scholiast on the Nubes of Aristophanes, quoting a passage in the treatise on Elocution, says, ὥς ἔφη Διονύσιος ὁ Ἀλικαρνασσεύς ἐν τῷ περὶ Ἑρμηνείας: For this and other reasons, Valesius ascribes the treatise on Elocution to Dionysius Halicarnasseus. Valesii Excerpta, p. 65. Menagii Observ. in Diog. Laert. l. v. § 81. Hod. de Bibl. Text. l. i. c. 9. p. 55.

Vossius, Gale, &c. ascribe it to some other Demetrius. Auctor videtur

A hundred and thirty comedies were circulated at Rome, under the name of Plautus ; but we are assured, that Varro, an excellent judge in this case, included only twenty-one in the list of that author's works.¹

Among the various pieces, which have been falsely ascribed to Cicero, the *CONSOLATIO* is the most remarkable. This tract made its first appearance in the year 1583, and is generally supposed to have been the work of Sigonius. "The essay de Consolatione," says Dr. Bentley, "as coming from a skilful hand, may perhaps pass for Cicero's with some, as long as Cicero himself shall last."² There is however an obvious and striking circumstance attending it, which alone seems to destroy all its pretensions to authenticity ; and that is, the passages quoted by Lactantius³ from Cicero's real work do not exist in the present *Consolatio*.

In the second century, we find the practice of forging books so very common, and so eagerly pursued, that it was impossible to guard against literary impositions.⁴ We have a memorable instance of those fraudulent schemes in the case of Galen. That eminent physician having been the author of many volumes, not only on medical subjects, but on philosophy, grammar, and rhetoric,⁵ lest his reputation should be injured by spurious publications, gave the world a particular account of his writings.⁶ Yet, notwithstanding this precaution, above forty books were fathered upon him, which are not included in his catalogue.⁷

alius Demetrius, rhetor Alexandrinus. Voss. Instit. Orat. l. vi. c. 2.—Tandem in sententiam Vossianam transivi. Gale præf. ad Rhet. Select.—Propendet animus ut credam, Demetrium Alexandrinum aureoli hujus libelli auctorem esse. Hudson. præf. ad Dionys. Halic.—Demetrii alicujus rhetoris libellus. Fabric. Bibl. Græc. l. iv. c. 31. § 1. vol. iv. p. 424.—Demetrius was a very common name. Diogenes Laertius mentions twenty, and Fabricius above a hundred Demetrii. Bibl. Græc. vol. x. p. 390.

The editor of Daniel secundum LXX. contends, that the treatise on Elocution is really the work of the celebrated Demetrius Phalereus. Dissert. iv. § 15.

¹ A. Gell. l. iii. c. 3.

² Bentley, Dissert. on Phil. p. 8.—See the opinions of several writers on this subject collected by Placcius, in his *Theatrum Pseudonymorum*, num. 646. p. 179—181.

³ Lactan. l. iii. c. 14. 18. Vid. Lipsii Opera, tom. i. edit. Moreti, p. 411. Clerici Art. Crit. tom. ii. p. 333.

⁴ Nemini non notum, quàm fertile et fœcundum scriptorum fictitiorum fuerit seculum secundum a Christo nato. Nihil magis tunc temporis in usu fuit, quàm libros emittere sub nominibus antiquiorum. Quod infinitis exemplis luculentò constat. Hodius, de Bibl. Text. Orig. l. i. c. 9. p. 53.

⁵ Suidas in v. Γαληνός.

⁶ Περὶ τῶν ἰδίων βιβλίων.

⁷ Galeno, quanquam de libris suis librum edidisset, quo testatum relinqueret, quinam a se conscripti libri essent, sunt tamen reperti homines

In this manner a multitude of spurious productions have been published under the names of Homer, Æsop, Euripides, Hippocrates, Aristophanes, Lysias,¹ Demosthenes, Plutarch, Lucian, Virgil, Ovid, Seneca, Quintilian, and almost every other eminent author of Greece and Rome.²

The forgeries of Annius Viterbiensis are well known. In the year 1497, this impudent monk published a volume, containing, as he pretended, the Antiquities of Berosus in five books; one book of Manetho's Supplement to Berosus; one book of Xenophon's *Æquivoca*; two books of Fabius Pictor on the Golden Age, and the Origin of Rome; one book of Myrsilus Lesbius on the Pelasgic War; one book of Cato's *Origines*; one book of an Itinerary by Antoninus Pius; one book of C. Sempronius, on the Division of Italy; a chronological tract by Archilochus; one book of Metasthenes³ on the Assyrian and Persian Annals; an Epitome of History by Philo in one book; a tract of Marius Aretius on the Situation of Sicily; and a Dialogue, containing a description of Spain, by the same author.⁴

These fragments were illustrated by the comments of Annius himself; and for some years passed for the genuine works of the authors, whose names they bear. They are now universally exploded, as the fictions of the editor.

The learned Dr. Prideaux, having occasion to mention the forgeries of Annius, the British History of Geoffrey of Monmouth,⁵

audaculi, qui illi præter a se nominatos ascripserunt libros plusquam quadraginta. Patric. Discuss. Peripat. tom. i. l. 3. p. 29.

¹ Harpocration, in his excellent Lexicon on the Ten Orators of Greece, when he mentions any oration of Lysias, or of others, the authenticity of which is not sufficiently ascertained, usually subjoins the words, *ἐὶ γνήσιος*, "if it be genuine." And this useful caution he repeats, on many occasions, in the course of his references. v. p. 11. 13. 16. 17. 22. 23. & alibi passim.

² Vid. Erasmi Epist. ad tom. iv. Hieron. Op. p. 5. Placcii Theatrum Pseudonymorum.

³ Ita eum ineptè vocat, qui est Megasthenes. Voss. de Hist. Lat. l. iii. c. 8. p. 609.

⁴ Berosi, sacerdotis Chaldaici antiquitatum libri quinque, &c. Romæ, 1497. folio. This collection was afterwards printed at Venice, Paris, Basil, Antwerp, and other places.

⁵ Geoffrey of Monmouth lived in the time of Henry the First and Stephen, and was bishop of St. Asaph in 1152. In his British History he affirms, that Brutus, the great-grandson of Æneas, and after him above seventy glorious monarchs, reigned in this island, during a period of 1053 years, before the invasion of Julius Cæsar. He continues his narrative to the death of Cadwallader, in the year 689.

This history contains the story of king Lear and his daughters; an account of the wonderful exploits of Uther Pendragon, and king Arthur; the prophecies of Merlin, and many similar curiosities.

and other productions of the same stamp, subjoins this reflection :
 " All these are no other than the fictions of the first editors. They framed them to perpetuate their names by the publication ; and they have truly done so, for they are still remembered for it ; but no otherwise, than under the style of INFAMOUS IMPOSTORS."¹

It is remarkable, that no province of literature has been so grievously infested with cheats and forgers, as that of Jewish and ecclesiastical antiquity². Here we read of the BOOKS of Abel, Seth, Enoch, Shem, Abraham, and Og the giant ; the TESTAMENTS of Adam, Noah, Abraham, Job, Moses, Solomon, and the twelve patriarchs ; the LITURGIES of Matthew, Mark, John, James, Peter, the Virgin Mary, and Jesus Christ ; the ACTS of Andrew, John, Mark, Matthias, Paul, Peter, Philip, Thomas, Pilate, Caiaphas, and Thecla ; the EPISTLES of Luke to Galen, Peter to James, John to a man who had the dropsy, Paul to the Laodiceans, and the Virgin Mary to Ignatius ; the GOSPELS of James, Andrew, Thomas, Philip, Bartholomew, Matthias, Barnabas, Thaddæus, Peter, Paul, Nicodemus, Judas Iscariot, and Eve ; the REVELATIONS of Peter, Stephen, Paul, Thomas, Solomon, Moses, Job, Elias, Abraham, Noah, Adam ; the MAGICAL WRITINGS of Solomon, Joseph, Abraham, Ham, and Noah.³

To this list we may add the following extract from a decree of pope Gelasius I. made in the year 494, *De Libris apocryphis, &c.*

Itinerarium nomine Petri apostoli, quod appellatur S. Clementis, libri viii. apocryphum.

Actus nomine Andreæ apostoli, apoc.

Actus nomine Philippi apostoli, apoc.

Actus nomine Petri apostoli, apoc.

Actus nomine Thomæ apostoli, apoc.

Evangelium nomine Thaddæi, apoc.

Evangelium nomine Thomæ apostoli, quo utuntur Manichæi, apoc.

Evangelium nomine Barnabæ, apoc.

¹ Prid. Connect. vol. ii. p. 804.

² Illud me vehementer movet, quòd videam primis ecclesiæ temporibus quamplurimos extitisse, qui facinus palmarium judicabant, cœlestem veritatem figmentis suis ire adjutum ; quo faciliùs videlicet nova doctrina à gentium sapientibus admitteretur. Officiosa hæc mendacia vocabant, bono fine excogitata. Quo ex fonte dubio procu sunt orti LIBRI SEXCENTI, quos illa ætas & proxima viderunt. Casaub. in Baron. Annales Exercit. 1. num. 18. p. 54.

³ Fabric. Codex Pseudepigraphus Vet. Test. Cod. Apoc. Nov. Test. passim.

Evangelium nomine Bartholomæi apostoli, apoc.

Evangelium nomine Andreæ apostoli, apoc.

Evangelia, quæ falsavit Lucianus, apoc.

Evangelia, quæ falsavit Hesychius, apoc.

Liber de Infantiâ Salvatoris, apoc.

Liber de Nativitate Salvatoris, et de S. Mariâ, et de obstetrice Salvatoris, apoc.

Liber, qui appellatur Pastoris, apoc.

Libri omnes, quos fecit Lenticius, discipulus diaboli, apoc.

Liber, qui appellatur de filiabus Adæ, vel Genesis, apoc.

Liber, qui appellatur Actus Theclæ & Pauli apostoli, apoc.

Revelatio, quæ appellatur Thomæ apostoli, apoc.

Revelatio, quæ appellatur Pauli apostoli, apoc.

Revelatio, quæ appellatur Stephani, apoc.

Liber, qui appellatur Transitus S. Mariæ, apoc.

Liber, qui appellatur Pœnitentia Adæ, apoc.

Liber, qui appellatur Diogenes, nomine gigantis, qui post diluvium cum dracone pugnassee perhibetur, apoc.

Liber, qui appellatur Testamentum Job, apoc.

Liber, qui appellatur Sortes apostolorum, apoc.

Liber, qui appellatur Laus apostolorum, apoc.

Liber Canonum apostolorum, apoc.

Epistola Jesu ad Abgarum regem, apocrypha, &c.¹

The decree, from which this catalogue is taken, is supposed by Dr. Cave,² and some other ecclesiastical writers, to be supposititious. But the learned Casaubon speaks of it in much more favourable terms. For having mentioned the gospel according to the Egyptians, the prophecy of Ham, the apocalypse of Moses, and other notorious forgeries, he calls it, "*insigniter salutare decretum*," a very salutary decree, in which, he says, many books of this despicable sort are specified and condemned.³

However, whether it is genuine or not, it will serve to show us, what numbers of absurd and scandalous publications were imposed upon the world, in the first ages of Christianity, under the respectable names of apostles and evangelists. "*Hanc legem*," says Varrerius on a quotation from the same decree, "*hic duximus subjiciendam, ut melius intelligatur, quantum præpostera hominum ingenia fallacibus hujusmodi et fucosis artibus delectentur.*"⁴—Supposing the decree itself is a forgery, it is but an addition to the impositions already mentioned.

If we descend to the primitive fathers, we shall find a multitude

¹ Fabric. Cod. Apoc. p. 65. 135. Varrerii Censura, p. 14. &c.

² Cave, Hist. Liter. sub an. 492.

³ Casaub. in Baron. Annal. Exercit. i. p. 22. 54.

⁴ De Beroso Censura, p. 14.

of spurious productions under their names. Cave¹ enumerates thirty pieces of that kind, which have been ascribed to Cyprian; thirty, which have appeared under the name of Jerom; sixty, which have been published as the works of Austin; seventy, which have been fathered on Chrysostom; and so on, in proportion to the reputation of each respective writer.

The number of forgeries, false records, and counterfeit antiquities, imposed upon the world by the advocates of the church of Rome,² in support of their religion, or, more properly speaking, their SYSTEM of SUPERSTITION, exceeds almost all imagination, and affords a deplorable instance of the depravity of mankind, and the facility with which knaves and bigots have suppressed every suggestion of conscience, reason, and religion, while they were engaged in the pursuit of what is absurdly, if not ironically, called a PIOUS FRAUD!

If we confine our observations to the present century, and to our own country in particular, we shall meet with several notorious instances of literary craft and imposition.

The late Psalmanazar wrote a fictitious history of Formosa,³ and invented a new language, which, he pretended, was the language of that island. The imposition was supported for some time; and the author was caressed as a prodigy of abstinence, piety, and learning. But in the latter part of his life, his conscience began to upbraid him; and, in a posthumous publication, he acknowledged, that the account, which he had given of Formosa, and of his travels and conversion from paganism to Christianity, was an infamous fiction.⁴

In the year 1747, the literati were surprised at the appearance of an Essay on Milton's Use and Imitation of the Moderns, in his

¹ Cave, Hist. Liter.

² See a book, entitled Roman Forgeries, published in 1673.

³ An historical and geographical Description of Formosa, 8vo. 1704.—A second edition of this work was published in 1705, with a preface, containing, "an answer to every thing, that had been objected against the author and his book."

Psalmanazar died in 1763, about the eighty-sixth year of his age.

⁴ Memoirs of ****, commonly known by the name of George Psalmanazar, a reputed native of Formosa, written by himself, in order to be published after his death, &c. 8vo. 1764.

In his will he says: "The principal manuscript I thought myself in duty bound to leave behind, is a faithful narrative of my education, and the sallies of my wretched youthful years, and the various ways by which I was, in some measure, unavoidably led into the base and shameful imposture, of passing upon the world for a native of Formosa, and a convert to Christianity, and backing it with a fictitious account of that island, and of my own travels, conversion, &c. all or most of it hatched in my own brain, without regard to truth and honesty." p. 5, 6.

Paradise Lost, by William Lauder;¹ the tendency of which was to show, that Milton was a plagiarist. In pursuance of this design, he charged Milton with having borrowed many parts of his plan, many passages, sentiments, and images, from the *Sarcotis* of Masenius, the *Adamus Exul* of Grotius, the *Triumphus Pacis* of Staphorstius, the *Comœdia Apocalyptica* of John Fox, the *Locustæ* of Phineas Fletcher, the *Bellum Angelicum* of Taubman,² and other similar productions.

Some of the examples which he produced in support of this accusation, bore such a striking resemblance to passages in the *Paradise Lost*, that many of his readers were inclined to applaud his sagacity, and the propriety of his remarks.

But while the enemies of Milton were shouting, *Io triumphe!* and insulting the memory of the injured poet, an acute and learned writer rose up in his defence, and effectually exposed this masterpiece of fraud and imposition, by demonstrating, that Lauder had inserted several passages of Hog's translation³ of *Paradise Lost*, and other lines of his own composition, into the extracts, which he had produced from Masenius, Staphorstius, and others; and then urged those very lines as a proof, that Milton had copied them.⁴

¹ Lauder commenced his attack upon Milton in the *Gentleman's Magazine* for January 1747; and continued his animadversions, at different times, in that publication. An imaginary success prompted him to reprint his extracts and observations, with considerable additions, in a separate volume, 8vo. which appeared in December 1749.

² Jacobus Masenius was professor of rhetoric and poetry, in the Jesuits' college at Cologn. His *Sarcotis* consists of five books, and was printed about the year 1654. An elegant edition of this poem, and of some other pieces, by Masenius and Grenan, was published at Paris in 1771, with some observations on Lauder's controversy.

Grotius is said to have written his tragedy, entitled, *Adamus Exul*, when he was only eighteen years of age. It was printed at Leyden in 1601; but was not inserted in the collection of his poems.

Caspar Staphorstius was a Dutch poet and divine. His *Triumphus Pacis* was a congratulatory poem, on the conclusion of the peace between the states of Holland and the commonwealth of England, in 1655.

John Fox, the martyrologist, published his *Comœdia Apocalyptica*, or *Christus Triumphans*, in 1551.

Phineas Fletcher was Fellow of King's College, Cambridge. His poem against the Jesuits, entitled *Locustæ, vel Pietas Jesuitica*, was printed in 1627.

Taubman, the author of *Bellum Angelicum*, printed about the year 1604, was the celebrated commentator on Plautus and Virgil.

³ *Paraphrasis poetica in tria Johannis Miltoni, V. C. poemata, viz. Paradisum Amisum, Paradisum Recuperatum, et Samsonem Agonistam.* Autore Gulielmo Hogæo. Londini, 1690.

⁴ Milton vindicated from the charge of plagiarism, brought against him by Mr. Lauder; and Lauder himself convicted of several FORGERIES and

As this charge was unanswerable, Lauder thought proper to throw himself on the candor of the public, by subscribing a penitential acknowledgment, dictated by a learned friend, of all his interpolations in the writers he had quoted.¹

In the year 1762, an enterprising writer published an epic poem in six books, entitled *Fingal*, and other pieces, of a singular character, under the name of *Ossian*, which were said to have been translated from the *Galic* or *Erse*. The truth of this assertion has been frequently controverted. It is however strenuously maintained by those who are advocates for the literary glory of *Caledonia*. But the very existence of *Ossian*, if ever there was such a poet, is, like the history of *Orpheus*, enveloped in fable and romance; and though we may allow the pretended translator to have collected some traditionary stories, some ancient fragments, and some strolling ballads, we may reasonably suspect, that the greatest part of these poems have been composed by the editor, as he has never condescended to favour the world with the works of *Ossian* in their original language, though such a publication has been frequently requested;² and would have not only silenced all objections, but have been esteemed a valuable curiosity in the republic of letters.³

About the beginning of the year 1777, the attention of the public was excited by a volume of *Poems*, which were said to have been written at *Bristol* by *Thomas Rowley*, a secular priest of that city, and others, in the fifteenth century.⁴ These pieces were read with surprise and admiration, and occasioned a variety of conjectures, relative to their authenticity. It was asserted, that

GROSS IMPOSITIONS on the public. By John Douglas, M. A. [late bishop of Salisbury. Ed.] 8vo. 1751.

A second edition of this pamphlet was published in 1756.

¹ This confession was entitled, *A Letter to the Rev. Mr. Douglas*, occasioned by his vindication of *Milton*, &c. By *Wm. Lauder*, A. M. 4to. 1751. It was dictated by *Dr. Johnson*, who, at first, had conceived a favorable opinion of *Lauder's* abilities and integrity. *Lauder* however, in the year 1754, retracted his confession, defended his essay, and made a new attack upon *Milton*, in a pamphlet, entitled, "*King Charles I. vindicated from the charge of plagiarism, brought against him by Milton; and Milton himself convicted of forgery, and a gross imposition on the public.*" — *Lauder* died in *Barbadoes*, about the year 1771.

² *Dr. Johnson* required, that the original should be deposited in either the king's or the marischal college at *Aberdeen*, and submitted to public inspection; but this was never done. *Hawkins's Life of Johnson*, p. 488.

³ It is said, that *Ossian* was the son of *Fingal*, a king of *Scotland*, celebrated for his prowess; that he lived in the beginning of the fourth century; and that these poems are superior to those of all other *Caledonian* bards, both in genius and antiquity.

⁴ In the reigns of *Henry VI.* and *Edward IV.*

the original manuscripts had been found in an old chest in Redcliff church, at Bristol, by one Chatterton the sexton; that Chatterton gave them to his nephew, the master of a writing-school in Pile-Street;¹ and that, after the death of the latter, they fell into the hands of his son, Thomas Chatterton, who sent some of them to the editors of the magazines, and disposed of others.

Some learned writers have maintained, that they are the genuine productions of Rowley;² others have supposed, that they were not written by Rowley, but forged by Chatterton,³ who probably derived the first idea of such a project from some old parchments, which might have been found, as he asserted, in a chest in Redcliff church.

This opinion seems to be much more probable than the other, for the following reasons.

1. It is hardly to be imagined, that all the poems, ascribed to Rowley, could have lain in a chest, unobserved and unexamined, for the space of 300 years; and that there should not, during this long interval, have been one, among all the learned vicars of Redcliff church, who had the curiosity to examine, and the sagacity to discover, the contents of this wonderful repository.

2. The phraseology, the splendid descriptions, the poetical images, the harmony of the versification, very unusual with writers of the fifteenth century, the manifest imitation of later poets, some apparent anachronisms, and OTHER CIRCUMSTANCES, are strong presumptive evidences, that they are not the compositions of Rowley.

Chatterton's abilities for a work of this nature can hardly be doubted, if we attend either to his comments on the poems attributed to Rowley, or to many similar pieces, which, we are assured, are his genuine and acknowledged productions.⁴

¹ Account of Chatterton by Dean Milles.

² Their authenticity is asserted in several publications, particularly the following:—"Poems, supposed to have been written at Bristol, by Thomas Rowley, &c. with a Commentary. By Jeremiah Milles, Dean of Exeter, 4to. 1782."

"Observations upon the Poems of Thomas Rowley, in which the authenticity of those poems is ascertained. By Jacob Bryant, Esq. 8vo. 1782."

³ Thomas Chatterton, the hero of this controversy, was born Nov. 20. 1752, and educated at a charity-school in Bristol. At the age of fourteen, he was articled clerk to an attorney in that city. In April 1770, he came to London, in hopes of advancing his fortune by his pen; but he was so miserably disappointed, that about four months afterwards, in a fit of despair, he put an end to his life, at the age of seventeen years and nine months.

⁴ See Remarks on Chatterton's Miscellanies by the Author of this Dissertation, in the Critical Review for August 1778, where it is shewn, that there have been many EARLY GENIUSES, equal or superior to Chatterton, in the republic of letters.

But, not to dwell any longer on supposititious BOOKS, let us proceed to fictitious INSCRIPTIONS.

About the year 1435, Cyriacus Anconitanus, surnamed the Antiquary, collected inscriptions, and other remains of antiquity, in different parts of Europe, Asia, and Africa.¹ He pretended to have found a multitude of inscriptions in Spain, as well as in other countries, which Ambrosius Morales, and other Spanish historians, quoted upon his authority. But the learned and judicious Antonius Augustinus, archbishop of Tarragon, assures us, that many of these inscriptions were fictitious; and that, in his time, none of them were to be seen in Spain.²

In 1534, Petrus Apianus and Bartholomæus Amantius published a large collection of antiquities at Ingolstadt, in which they inserted a considerable number of those which had been either collected or invented by Kyriacus.³ The learned writer I have just now

On this occasion, the present Dissertator, though he owns those insignificant remarks, would wish to intimate, that his concern in the same Review extended only from August 1764 to September 1785 inclusive; and that he is not, at present, accountable for any criticisms which appear in that publication.

¹ Cyriacus's inscriptions, in three volumes, folio, entitled, *Antiquarum Rerum Commentaria*, were never entirely published. Some of them only were communicated by himself to his friends; about 200 were printed by C. Moronus in 1660, and others have appeared in different collections.

A small volume in 12mo. entitled, *Kyriaci Anconitani Itinerarium*, was published by Laurentius Mehus, at Florence, in 1742, containing eight Letters by Kyriacus, and a preface by the editor, in vindication of the author's literary character. But this publication contains no inscriptions, nor any very important information.

² *Kyriaci Anconitani inscriptiones plurimas in Annalibus Hispaniæ Ambrosius Morales temerè descripsit. B. Mirari equidem soleo in tot tantisque antiquis inscriptionibus, quas ille attulit, nullas hodie in Hispaniâ legi. A. Illud incommodi est, videri Joannem Annum & Cyriacum, similisque farinæ homines, Hispanos irridere voluisse, confictis Hispanorum rebus gestis sub Noâ, Tubale; serie item contextâ regum falsorum, quasi nostris regnassent temporibus; fictis adhæc lapidibus, de bello cum Viriatho, & Sertorio; civili quoque Cæsaris ac Pompeii, &c. Augustini Antiquitatum Dialogi. xi. p. 161.*

Augustinus's Dialogues were published in the Spanish language in 1587, and translated into Latin by And. Schottus, 1617. The author died in 1588, aged 71 years. Voss. de Hist. Lat. l. iii. c. 10. p. 809.

Reinesius speaks favourably of Cyriacus. *Inscript. Antiq. præf. p. ii.*

³ This collection bears the following title: *Inscriptiones sacrosanctæ vetustatis, non illæ quidem Romanæ, sed totius ferè orbis, summo studio ac maximis impensis terrâ marique conquistæ, feliciter incipiunt. Magnifico viro, domino Raymundo Fuggero, &c. Petrus Apianus Mathematicus, & Bartholomæus Amantius Poeta. D. E. D. Ingolstadii, anno MDXXXIV.*

Primi, qui excerpta ex Kyriaci schedis typis excuderunt, fuere Petrus Apianus & Bartholomæus Amantius. *Kyriaci Itin. præf. p. 59.*

cited affirms, that many of these inscriptions are forged by different authors.¹

About the year 1520, Alexander Geraldinus pretended to have found in various parts of Ethiopia, on both sides of the equinoxial line, many Roman inscriptions and antiquities,² more valuable (if genuine) than all the inscriptions and antiquities which the rest of the world could produce. But it is observable, that no traveller, besides himself, ever saw these curiosities; and, as M. de la Mothe le Vayer remarks, “it is the greatest impertinence to raise imaginary pillars, and bear testimony to the conquests and dominion of the Romans, in places, where apparently no Roman ever set his foot, and in direct opposition to their own historians.”³ Geraldinus appears to have been as great a traveller, and—as great a romancer, as Leo Africanus: *par nobile fratrum!*

In 1636, Curtius Inghiramius published a volume of Tuscan Antiquities,⁴ containing a multitude of Latin inscriptions, relative to the origin of Volaterra, Sena, Rome, &c. which, he says, he found under-ground at Scornellum, near Volaterra. The inscriptions, he tells us, were written by one Prosperus Fesulanus, who lived in the time of Cicero,⁵ and deposited by him in that place, with an epistle to the finder, in which he prophetically describes the said Inghiramius; lays many strict injunctions on him not to communicate the originals to any one; and denounces the most horrible calamities on such as should presume to steal, to touch them, to depreciate the credit of the finder, or rob him of the glory, to which he was entitled for the discovery of these inestimable treasures.⁶

¹ In antiquitatibus orbis totius, a Petro Apiano & Bartholomæo Amantio foras datis, fictæ multæ sunt a diversis auctoribus inscriptiones. Aug. Dial. xi. p. 162. Menagiana, tom. iv. p. 263.—One of the first in this collection is the foolish prophecy of H. Cadjus, which will be mentioned hereafter.

² Alexandri Geraldini Itinerarium ad regiones sub æquinoxiali plagâ constitutas. [anno 1520; complectens antiquitates & ritus populorum Æthiopiæ, Africae, Atlantici oceani, & Indicarum regionum. Accesserunt auctoris opuscula alia, edente Onuphrio Geraldino, ejus abnepote.] 8vo. Romæ, 1631.—Geraldinus was made bishop of St. Domingo, the capital of Hispaniola, in 1516, and died in 1525.

³ De la Mothe le Vayer, des anciens Historiens Grecs & Latins.

⁴ This work is entitled, *Ethruscarum Antiquitatum Fragmenta*, quibus urbis Romæ, aliarumque gentium primordia, mores, & res gestæ indicantur, à Curtio Inghiramiio reperta Scornelli prope Vulterram. Francofurti, anno salutis MDCXXXVII. *Ethrusco verò cIo cIo cIo cIo ccccxcv. Folio.* A former edition was printed at Florence in 1636.

⁵ Bef. Chr. 60.

⁶ Alius, si fortè invenerit, eas scripturas tangere non audeat; alioquin superflum infernorumque deorum iram expertus peribit infelix. . . Si quis has scripturas quovis modo sibi arripuerit, famæ et corporis jacturam faciet

It is easy to see the author's views in throwing out these denunciations. Though they were perfectly absurd and ridiculous, they were plainly intended to check the impertinent curiosity, the animadversions, and the ridicule of his opposers.

The whole performance however bears the most obvious marks of fraud and imposition.¹ The characters do not in the least correspond with the mode of writing in the time of Cicero; the Latinity is mean and barbarous; the customs, which are occasionally mentioned, were unknown in ancient Rome; and the stories, which are told of the patriarch Noah, are alone sufficient to expose the grossness of the cheat.

To these remarks we may add, that the artist very simply and inadvertently wrote his inscriptions on paper, which was known to have been made about the time of the pretended discovery.²

Some have ascribed this performance to Postellus;³ some, to Paganinus Gaudentius; others affirm, that the author was Thomas Phædrus or Fœdrus, who was keeper of the Vatican library, about the year 1490. It is most probable, that Inghiramius himself was the real fabricator of all these ridiculous inscriptions.⁴

But the most enterprizing and eminent practitioner in the art of making fictitious inscriptions, was Anniius of Viterbo, whom I have already mentioned. Antonius Augustinus gives us the following account of the process, which Anniius observed in his forgeries.

“*Mihi Latinus Latinus⁵ Viterbiensis, vir doctus, bonæque fidei, de Joanne Annio, Viterbiensi monacho, narrare jucundè solebat lapidi insculpendas curâsse literas, quem vineæ infodi jusserat, non procul a Viterbio. Cùmque fodienda esset vinea, ad lapidem usque ut fodiendo pervenirent jussit; narrans in libris se reperisse, templum ibi orbis terrarum antiquissimum latere. Terrâ jam effossâ, primus, qui lapidem invenit, vinitor accurrit; paulatim detegi sarcophagum imperat. Hic stupens, lapidis antiquitatem, & literas a se confictas, admiratur; ac describens, ad urbis sena-*

. . . Si quis nomen suum augere his scripturis, vel tuum deprimere fuerit ausus, rerum suarum, vitæ, & honoris, maximum damnum passus omnibus ludibrio erit. Verùm nec hæredes tui nec tu, inventas scripturas aliis dare audeatis, nam malum instat, sed transcriptas poteris dare cui volueris, &c. p. 3, 4.

¹ Vid. Leon. Allatii Animadversiones in Antiquitatum Etruscarum Fragmenta, ab Inghiramio edita, 4to. Paris, 1640.

² Ibid. p. 91.

³ Voss. de Hist. Lat. l. i. c. 9. p. 41.

⁴ Fabric. Bibl. Lat. l. iv. c. 13. § 3. p. 601. Vid. Saxii Onomast. vol. iv. p. 422. Placcii Theat. Pseudon. p. 523.

⁵ Latinus Latinus was born at Viterbo about the year 1513. He published notes on Tertullian, and a work, entitled, *Bibliotheca sacra et profana, sive observationes, correctiones, conjecturæ, & variæ lectiones.*

tores lætus confugit, & civitatis honori fore persuadet, in amplissimo publicè spectari loco. Viterbii enim urbis originem contineri, quæ bis mille annis Romanâ esset urbe a Romulo conditâ longè antiquior, utpote ab Iside & Osiride conditæ. Fabulas hic suas, quibus abundabat, venditavit, factumque ut ille jusserrat. Fertur manuscripta inscriptio ficta, typis etiam evulgata, hoc initio, EGO SUM ISIS."¹

"Latinus Latinus, a native of Viterbo, a man of learning and veracity, used to relate, with some humour, the following anecdote of John Annius, a Dominican friar of that city.

"Annius got an inscription engraved on a stone, which he buried in a vineyard near Viterbo. When the labourers were employed in digging the ground, he directed them to proceed till they came to the spot where the stone was deposited; telling them he had found in his books, that the ruins of the most ancient temple in the world lay under-ground in that place. After the earth was removed, the stone actually appeared; upon which the vine-dresser, who first discovered this wonderful curiosity, ran to Annius, and acquainted him with what he had found. The sarcophagus was ordered to be removed with all possible care. Annius, in the mean time, seemed to be astonished at the antiquity of the stone, and extremely delighted with the inscription. In the height of his pretended exultation, he flew to the magistrates of Viterbo, expatiated on the nature and importance of the discovery, and persuaded them, that this venerable monument of antiquity would be an everlasting honour to the city, if they would remove it to a conspicuous place, where it might be publicly exhibited. He observed, that it related to the origin of Viterbo; and that Rome, founded 2000 years since by Romulus, was far inferior in point of antiquity to Viterbo, which was built by Isis and Osiris. With these romantic stories, which he readily invented, he amused the public; and his orders were instantly obeyed. An inscription was circulated in manuscript, and afterwards printed, beginning with these words, EGO SUM ISIS, I am Isis."

A project of the same kind was managed, with some success, by one Hermicus Cajadus, or Hermio Gajado, a Portuguese poet, about the year 1505.² When his countrymen had made a conquest of several places in Africa, and the East Indies, he composed some Latin verses, in the style of a Sibylline prophecy, foretelling these conquests; and having engraved them on three marble columns, he MUTILATED THE STONES, and DEFACED some of the inscriptions, in order to give them an appearance of antiquity. He

¹ August. Dial. xi. p. 160.

² Cajadus died of intoxication in 1508. Ladvoat.

then buried them in the ground ; and, at a proper opportunity, contrived a scheme for the discovery, which was artfully managed, and attended with great exultation. The inscription, which was undefaced, was read, admired, touched and kissed, with the profoundest veneration ; and afterwards published as a divine prophecy.¹

The Duilian inscription has been reckoned a most curious and valuable relic of antiquity,² yet Selden seems to question its au-

¹ Is Latinis carminibus commentus fuerat Sibyllinam vaticinationem, in columnis marmoreis incisam, quæ per ambages significabat, Indos sub imperium & ditionem Lusitanorum esse venturos, eosque lapides datâ operâ DETRUNCATOS, ut aliqua inessent ANTIQUITATIS vestigia, obrui præcepit. . . Ubi verò defossa marinora aliquod vitium fecisse, ex humore terreno, judicavit, ad certam diem, simulatâ delectationis causâ, invitat amicos in villam suam, quæ proxima erat loco, ubi obrutum latebat vaticinium. Cum igitur accubuissent omnes, ecce villicus nunciat Hermico, mercenarias ejus operas, dum in fundo fossionibus incumberent, incidisse in lapides, in quibus inscriptæ essent literæ, indices magni quisdam thesauri, eodem loco defossi ; sic enim rustici opinabuntur. Nec morâ, omnes simul, alacritate ingenti, relictis epulis, accurrunt, defossas intuentur columnas, confestimque extrahi jubent : in quibus incisa hujusmodi erant carmina Sibyllina :

Sibyllæ vaticinium, occidiis decretum.
Volventur saxa literis, & ordine rectis,
Cum videas occidens orientis opes.
Ganges Indus Tagus erit, mirabile visu,
Merces commutabit suas uterque sibi.
Soli æterno, ac lunæ decretum.

Tum vero omnes, pro se quisque legere, admirari, versus illos fatidicos venerari, manu tangere, exosculari . . . Ita Sibyllina fabula vires acquirit eundo, ac tandem per totum terrarum orbem divulgata, fides ei ubique et auctoritas adjungitur, hodieque typis excusa circumfertur in fronte codicis, cui titulus est, "Inscriptiones antiquæ." Varrerii Censura in quendam Auctorem, qui sub falsâ Inscriptione Berosi Chaldæi circumfertur, p. 15. ed t. 1598. Fabric. Bibl. Lat. l. iv. c. 13. vol. ii. p. 607.

² C. Duilius commanded the Roman fleet in the first Carthaginian war, and gained a complete victory. To perpetuate the memory of this triumph, a pillar of white marble was erected to his honour at Rome. This pillar is called *Columna rostrata*, from the rostra, or beaks of ships, with which it was adorned. On the basis of the column was an inscription, recording the exploits of Duilius, and the value of the booty, which was taken in the Carthaginian ships. The remains of this pillar were accidentally dug up, in the year 1560, in the place, which was formerly the Forum Romanum ; and, by the order of Cardinal Alexander Farnese, were removed to the capitol.

The inscription, which is in old Latin, is supposed to have been written 260 years before the Christian æra, and is reckoned the most ancient Latin monument now remaining.

Justus Lipsius endeavoured to supply the deficiencies in the inscription. Pet. Ciacconius did the same, and explained the sense in a learned commentary, entitled, *Pet. Ciacconii in Columnæ Rostratæ C. Duilii inscriptionem, a se conjecturâ suppletam, Commentarius*. Lug. Bat. 1597. Græv.

thenticity; for having occasion to mention its age, in speaking of the Parian Chronicle, he intimates his suspicions in these words, *si nimirum genuina est.*¹

Reinesius asserts, that Fulvius Ursinus has published many fictitious inscriptions.²

Fleetwood, in his *Inscriptionum Antiquarum Sylloge*, informs his readers, that though he was, as much as possible, on his guard against false and fictitious inscriptions, he often found, that he had inadvertently inserted, "*plurimas apertè spurias,*" many that are evidently spurious.³ And Stillingfleet affirms, that there are many counterfeits in Gruter's collection.⁴

As a farther confirmation of what I have here observed, I shall subjoin the remarks of a learned writer, who in this instance has advanced none of his usual paradoxes.

"*Falsarum inscriptionum architectos proximum nostro sæculum INNUMEROS tulit; egregios artifices, qui, quas ipsi magnâ, ut sibi quidem videbantur, arte concinnassent, has aut in marmoribus, aut in tabulis æneis, plumbeisve, aut lateritiis fistulis, aut in antiquis denique numismatis, lectas a se fuisse mentirentur. Sed et aliquot ante ætatibus fraus eadem in usu fuit. Plena sunt pergamena manu exarata fictis in otio inscriptionibus, epitaphiis, elogiis; quæ cum inde eruuntur a viris etiam alioqui magnis ac probis, sed minus justo suspiciosi, ab eorundem suffragio pondus illa accipiunt; ac deinde mirificè inquinant perturbantque prophanam historiam, utinam verò non etiam ecclesiasticam.*

"*Superiore porrò sæculo, insigniores harum inscriptionum fabricatores fuere Jovianus Pontanus, Pomponius Lætus, Joannes Camers, Cyriacus Anconitanus, aliique.*⁵ *Hos enim in primis nominatim designat Antonius Augustinus, Dialogo xi. p. 161. 'E Cyriaci verò officinâ plurimas in Annales Hispaniæ transfudit Ambrosius Morales,' et exinde Gruterus in Thesaurum suum; e tot autem inscriptionibus nullum hodie in Hispaniâ legi, testis est idem*

Thesaur. tom. iv. p. 1807. *Univ. Hist.* vol. xvii. p. 224. 506. xii. p. 171. edit. 1740.

¹ Seld. *Marm. Arund.* in edit. Ansâ, p. 3.

² De Ursino dixeram, cautè me arripere solere, quas ab ipso profectas scirem inscriptiones; & paratus sum, si quis postulet, *FICTITIAS* eum *PLURIMAS* extrusisse probare. Reinesii ad Rupertum *Epist.* 50. p. 456. *Epist.* 43. p. 418. *Epist.* 51. p. 487. 490. Fabric. *Bibl. Lat.* l. iv. c. 5.

³ *Epist. dedic.* p. 10.

⁴ "Not only authors, but other monuments of antiquity, were then counterfeited, as appears by many in Gruter's Collection of Inscriptions." Stillingf. *Orig. Brit.* pref. p. 1.

⁵ Jovianus Pontanus fl. circa. 1460. Saxii *Onomast.* Pomponius Lætus, circa 1484. *Ibid.* Joannes Camers, circa 1510. *Ibid.*

⁶ Ambrosius Moralis, sive De Morales, circa 1574.

Antonius Augustinus, vir summæ eruditionis, limatique judicii, qui de Joanne Annio, Italisque aliis præterea conqueritur, quòd suæ, nempe Hispaniæ, genti epigrammata et marmora obtruserint, nec visa illis, nec ab Hispanis reperta; atque ea demum ille cum Amadisii Gallici et Orlandi Furiosi nugis commentisque confert. Inscriptionum hujusmodi immensam supellectilem, quadraginta amplius digestam voluminibus, olim collegit Pyrrhus Ligorius; quæ Romæ extare dicitur in bibliothecâ Barberinnâ et Farnesianâ. Quâ in vastâ mole atque congerie, Spanhemius, vir eruditus, confitetur, p. 141. “plura esse aut dubiæ fidei, aut confessæ novitatis.” Nec tantam ille crevisse segetem putat, nisi ex plurimorum fraude, qui Ligorio viro bono fucum fecerint. Farraginem eam esse subdit, quæ possit incautis imponere, avidis ad quamcumque ciborum novitatem, viris etiam alioquin eruditis, sed, ut dixi, minime suspiciosi. Neque enim *HEBETES* ac *STULTI* sunt, qui dant operam, ut hâc arte fallant. Sic Muretus olim Scaligero ipsi imposuit, quem induxit ut crederet, Attii et Trabeæ,¹ veterum, ut aiunt, poetarum carmina quædam esse; quæ idem Muretus, a se conficta, sub eorum nominibus Scaligero submiserat. E veteribus etiam schedis Josephi Scaligeri describitur a Grutero posita, ut quidem ait, Nicomediæ inscriptio: quis hanc, amabo, ad Scaligerum Nicomediâ attulit?

“Atqui non Gruterum modò, sed et eos, qui volumini ejus amplificando suam veluti symbolam contulerunt, fefellerunt ii, qui vel ex marmoribus ea se descripsisse elogia testati sunt; vel eruta ex membranis fallacibus insculpere lapidibus, superiore præsertim sæculo, ad aliquam patriæ suæ laudem, incautè sategerunt; vel *QUI DENIQUE INSIGNI FRAUDE INSCULPSERE IPSI, AC TELLURI SUFFODERUNT, QUÆ DEINDE VEL IPSIMET, VEL POSTERI, EFFOSSA INGENTI AURO VENDERENT*. Vix enim repertum erutumve talem fuisse lapidem reperias, ante annum *MDX*. Post hunc annum innumera sunt, eo quem diximus astu, reperta. Itaque in illo Thesauro Gruteriano *INFINITI CARBONES LATENT*. Neque ex sexaginta ferè inscriptionibus, quæ Constantiniani hujus sæculi esse æstimantur, vel una quidem sincera est, si inscriptionem *Arcûs Constantiniani* exceperis.”²

Similar observations occur in almost every author, who has written upon the subject.

¹ See an account of this imposition in Fabric. Bibl. Lat. l. iv. c. 1. p. 193. edit. 1728.

² Harduini Opera Selecta, p. 501.

ON THE SCIENCE
OF THE EGYPTIANS AND CHALDEANS.
PART I.

Juvat ire per alta

Astra.

HOR.

THE more we study the writings of the ancient Greeks, the more we shall be convinced, that no people has surpassed them in taste or in genius, in the cultivation of the elegant arts, and in all the refinements of polished life. The creators of epic, lyric, and dramatic poetry, the most skilful orators, the most eloquent historians, and the most liberal, if not the most profound philosophers, they would still continue to command our admiration, even if we could forget the wisdom of their political institutions, or cease to be dazzled by the splendour of their military achievements. While the history of literature exists, its most brilliant pages will probably ever be those, which record how a Homer sang, and how a Plato thought. But in awarding to the Greeks this ample portion of praise, let us not refuse to other nations the applause which is due to their industry, their learning, and their labours.

Upon what principle has it been, and is it still, that most modern writers, in treating of the origin and progress of the sciences, express themselves with contempt of the philosophical attainments of the ancient inhabitants of the East? Some imperfect acquaintance with geometry, mechanics, and astronomy, is indeed accorded to the Egyptians and the Chaldeans; but general opinion certainly estimates the scientific knowledge of those ancient nations as far inferior to that of the Greeks. He, who visits Athens, sees enough to be convinced, that he surveys in its ruins the remains of a splendid city; while the traveller, who wanders over the deserted site of Babylon, may be disposed to question the truth of some of those pompous descriptions, which have been vaguely given of the wealth and magnificence of the Assyrian capital. It is thus perhaps, that modern enquirers hesitate in assenting to the eulogies, which have been occasionally pronounced upon the learning and knowledge of the sages of Egypt and the East. The boasted edifice of Oriental wisdom has disappeared; and only a few remnants can be found to indicate its extent, or even to attest its existence.

Among the ancient philosophers of Europe, Pythagoras and his disciples seem to have been better instructed than any others in the learning of the Orientalists. The system of physics, however, which they taught, was far from being generally adopted by the Greeks; and the information, which we possess concerning it, is extremely limited. Still we can scarcely doubt, that this system had its origin in the East; nor can we deny, that in many respects the opinions of the Samian philosopher are similar to those, which modern Europe has received as unquestionable truths. But while it is admitted, that the Oriental instructors of Pythagoras must have been acquainted with the true system of the material universe, it is contended, that their general conclusions were obtained rather by conjecture than by research, and were less the result of scientific enquiry than of hypothetical reasoning. The Chaldeans and Egyptians, it is said, had not the means of becoming scientific astronomers: they had no instruments which can be compared with those of modern construction: they possessed no telescopes: with the higher parts of mathematics they were wholly unacquainted: they knew nothing of fluxions: they employed no calculus: they had scarcely acquired the elements of algebra. Let us remember, it may be added, that Thales was the first, who calculated an eclipse of the sun—that Pythagoras invented the problem concerning the square of the hypotenuse—that Hipparchus discovered the method of taking the parallax of a planet—and let us conclude, that before the Greeks very little progress indeed had been made in the exact sciences.

If these assertions could be proved to be indisputably true, the conclusions drawn from them would become irresistibly triumphant. But how can we know, that these assertions are true? How can it be shown, that the Chaldeans and Egyptians did not employ instruments as well constructed as our own; that they possessed no telescopes; or that they were ignorant of the higher parts of mathematics? Had not Thales studied at Memphis, before he predicted an eclipse in Asia? Who does not see, that when Pythagoras uttered the far-famed *εὑρηκα*, he meant to say, not that he had made a new discovery, but that he had found what he had lost, or, in other words, had remembered what he had forgotten? If no method had been known for taking the sun's parallax before the time of Hipparchus, how could Pythagoras, 400 years before, have estimated the diameter of the earth, when compared with that of the sun, as 1 to 42? It is probable, that the Samian sage must have made this conclusion from his own

observations, as we shall have reason to think presently, that his Oriental masters would have given him a far more exact result. (The real proportion is about as 1 to 112.)

Before I proceed farther, I wish to remark to my readers, that neither Pythagoras nor his immediate disciples appear to have left any writings behind them, sufficiently explanatory of their system to be understood by the uninitiated. Now it is of great importance to our present enquiry to observe, that those Greeks, who have transmitted to us the astronomical system, introduced into Europe by the Samian philosopher, evidently did not understand it, and were ignorant of the principles upon which it had been originally established by the sages of the East. Even the Pythagoreans, who did adopt this system, may be suspected of having generally taken it for granted upon the word of the *Master*. It is clear, that Aristarchus and Eratosthenes, for example, repeated by rote various scientific truths, which they could not have discovered, and must have been unable to demonstrate. Accordingly Hipparchus and Ptolemy, who were themselves practical astronomers, rejected those truths, which their predecessors had adopted upon report, and which their own limited science, and their want of instruments, did not enable them to prove.

But it may be asked, why, if the Orientalists possessed all this profound knowledge, might not the disciples of the school of Alexandria have studied among them the secrets of their philosophy? If the Egyptians and Chaldeans could teach the most abstruse and important truths to Pythagoras, and could unfold to him the system of nature and the universe, why should they have withheld the same information from men so illustrious as Hipparchus, Archimedes, and Ptolemy? I answer, that I am far from believing that the priests of Egypt and Chaldea instructed Pythagoras in all their knowledge. That philosopher had certainly not sounded all the depths of Oriental learning. Thus the priests of Egypt do not appear to have communicated to him, as they did afterwards to Plato, the length of the solar year; but there is a reason which can be assigned for this, and which I shall presently state. In the mean time I would wish to remark, and it is a point to which I particularly desire to call the attention of the reader, that Pythagoras was the last philosopher of Greece, who visited Egypt and Chaldea, while the arts and sciences flourished in those countries. What the priests knew and taught in after times had been preserved by tradition. They were still acquainted with the length of the solar year in the time of Plato and Eudoxus; and

they freely communicated their knowledge on this subject to those philosophers, because the law, which appears to have bound them to silence in the time of Pythagoras no longer existed. The priests of Egypt obliged their Kings to take an oath to preserve the established year of 365 days. (See Jablonski Panth. Ægypt.) Consequently there was a new *thoth* every fourth established year, while to preserve the true time, the priests themselves intercalated a day every fourth year. This then was one of their *arcana*, which during the Egyptian monarchy they were not likely to divulge to strangers. But when Plato visited Egypt, that country had no longer a King of its own. It had long been governed by the Kings of Persia; its laws had been changed, its temples profaned, and its priests degraded.

Pythagoras, however, seems to have obtained the knowledge of many truths from the Egyptians and Chaldeans, which could hardly have been preserved by those nations, even half a century after the death of that philosopher. The reason is sufficiently obvious. Pythagoras is said to have died at an advanced age, 497 years before Christ. He consequently visited Egypt and Chaldea in his youth, before the events happened of which I am about to speak. The Assyrian empire was subverted, and Babylon was taken, by the Persians under Cyrus, 538 years before our æra; and the conquest of Egypt was achieved by Cambyzes, the son of Cyrus, 13 years after the subjection of Assyria. These events produced a mighty revolution in both countries. The Babylonians were plundered of their wealth; their laws were abrogated; and the whole form of their institutions, both public and private, was changed. (Herodot. l. i. and iii. Xenophon. Cyropæd. l. vii. and viii. Dan. c. vii.) They rebelled against their tyrants; but their city was again taken by Darius Hystaspes, who diminished the height of its lofty walls, and put to death 3000 of its most eminent inhabitants. Xerxes, the son of Darius, carried away the golden statue of Belus, (Herodot. l. iii.) and destroyed the temple of that God. (Arrian. l. vii. Strabo. l. xvi.) In the mean time Egypt had not suffered less than Chaldea under the same terrible masters. Cambyzes persecuted the priests, pillaged the temples, and burnt the idols. (Herodot. l. iii.) Some abortive rebellions, which took place after the death of the tyrant, proved at once the sufferings and the weakness of the Egyptians.

From this statement it must be evident, that the sciences could no longer have been cultivated in Chaldea and in Egypt, even at the period when Herodotus visited those countries. It is known to every

one, that the priests alone were versant in the abstruse sciences; and that the *ἱερα*, or sacred places, contained all their books, records, and instruments. Shall we believe then, that the ferocious Cambyses, and the despotic Xerxes, respected the sciences of those nations, whose religion they detested? When the former profaned the temples of Ptha and of the Cabiri, can it be imagined that his soldiers spared any of the objects, which the science or the curiosity of the Egyptians had collected? Can it be supposed, when the latter destroyed the tower of Belus, and murdered the priests, that the astronomical instruments of the Chaldeans, their clocks, quadrants, and armillary spheres, were not all comprehended in the ruin of that magnificent observatory?

Thus, in following the authority of the Greeks themselves, we must admit that Pythagoras was the last philosopher of his nation, who visited Chaldea and Egypt, before those countries had experienced all the horrors of conquest and revolution. But it may be said, that my statement cannot be admitted; *first*, because the temple of Belus, in which the Chaldeans appear to have kept all their mathematical instruments, existed in the time of Herodotus, by whom it is fully described—*secondly*, because Cambyses, though he profaned the temples of Ptha and of the Cabiri, did not violate, as far as we can judge from the account of Herodotus, the sanctuaries of the other deities of Egypt—and *thirdly*, because the books of Thoth, or Hermes Trismegistus, were preserved for many ages after the death of Cambyses, whence it may be inferred, that the archives, the astronomical instruments, the keys to the hieroglyphical symbols, and all other objects appertaining to science and literature, were left untouched by that Prince.

1. In answer to the first of these objections I reply, that Herodotus has not described Babylon as it existed in his own time. His account of that city appears to have been taken from the reports and traditions which he had heard concerning it. Thus the walls could not have been 200 cubits in height and 50 in breadth in the time of Herodotus, since they had been reduced in height during the reign of Darius Hystaspes, who was dead before the historian was born. His account of the temple of Belus is by no means a clear one, and must have been taken from report, since according to Arrian and Strabo this temple was destroyed by Xerxes, and Herodotus did not visit Asia until after the death of that monarch.

2. It is not to be inferred from the silence of Herodotus, that when Cambyses violated the shrines of Pthia and of the Cabiri, he respected those of Amoun, Mendes, and Osiris. Memphis was not the only theatre of the destructive cruelty of the Persian conqueror. He burnt and pillaged the temples at Thebes, and persecuted the priests in every province of Egypt. (Diodor. Sicul. l. i. Strabo. l. x. and l. xvii.) It is indeed evident, that the priests endeavoured to conceal, as much as they could, from Herodotus the disasters of their country, and the degradation of their own order. But that the calamities of Egypt were excessive may be certainly concluded from the positive testimony of the sacred writers. The prophets designated the Prince, whom the Greeks called Cambyses, by the merely titular name of Nebuchadnezzar; and announced that he should lay waste with fire and sword the whole land of Egypt, which, according to the prediction of Ezekiel, was to be made "utterly waste and desolate, from the tower of Syene even unto the border of Cush;" (i. e. Arabia.) Nor was the season of Egyptian calamity of short duration. It continued for the space of forty years; and the prophets clearly intimate that Egypt was never to recover her former rank among nations. The same sacred writers allude distinctly to the destruction of the idols, and to the degradation of the priests, "the wise counsellors of Pharaoh."

3. Herodotus states, that the priests read to him a long list of the names of their kings; but he makes no mention, as far as I remember, of the books of Thoth. Plato flourished about sixty years after Herodotus. He says, that Theuth, as he writes the name, was the inventor of several sciences; but he is silent with respect to the existence of his books. In fact I am not aware, that any Greek writer has spoken of the existence of those books before Manetho, who lived 150 years after Plato, and who pretended to have taken the materials of his history from the writings of Hermes Trismegistus. The value of Manetho's testimony may be estimated from his own statement, since, according to Iamblichus, he had the effrontery to assert, that Hermes had written 36526 volumes! Clemens Alexandrinus, who flourished 450 years after Manetho, says that 42 books of Hermes were extant in his time. May we not, however, justly suspect, that the priests, as soon as they began to enjoy some repose after the persecution, which lasted for 40 years, endeavoured to supply the records which had been destroyed, and forged various writings under the name of Thoth? Manetho himself, according to Eusebius, was a high-priest (*ἀρχιερεὺς*) of the Egyptian idols; and it is not unlikely, that he

may have had his share in composing the 36526 books, which he attributed to the miraculous pen of Hermes Trismegistus. But we have direct evidence, that Cambyzes did not spare the astronomical instruments of the Egyptians, for he not only pillaged the sacred enclosures, but carried away, as Diodorus attests, the golden circle of Osymandias. The same historian likewise states, that the Persian tyrant burnt all the temples at Thebes. It seems to me very improbable, under these circumstances, that the Egyptians could have preserved any of the monuments of their literature, that could either be easily removed, or easily destroyed.

Since then neither Thales nor Pythagoras left behind them any written accounts of what they had seen in Egypt and the East; since no Greek traveller, after their age, could have visited those countries, while the arts and sciences continued to flourish there; and since it appears nearly certain, that the Persian conquerors did not spare the books and instruments of the mathematicians, when they pillaged the temples, and burnt the images of the idolators; I know not how it can be argued from the testimony of the Greeks, that the ancient Chaldeans and Egyptians had no instruments fit for the nicer operations of science. I can say nothing of the accuracy of the golden circle of Osymandias, or of the armillary spheres, which the Greeks, after their manner, fabled to have been constructed by the giant Atlas, and by the centaur Chiron. But I cannot doubt that, from very remote antiquity, the Egyptians had cultivated the sciences. Their mighty works still attest this truth. Who shall name the distant age, when the pyramids were built? Yet the powers of machinery must have been well understood by the people, who conveyed such massive stones from the quarries in the hills, and piled them one above another in the valleys. The architect, who planned the great pyramid, must have known how to take a meridian. Nor is this all; he must have been well skilled in astronomy. But I reserve the discussion of this subject for another opportunity.

We hear it loudly urged, that as the ancients were not acquainted with the use of the telescope, it is vain to compare them as astronomers with the moderns. The telescope is said to have been invented in the beginning of the 17th century; and Galileo is affirmed to have been the first astronomer, who employed in the service of science this mighty engine of knowledge. But it is impossible for us, at the present day, to prove that no telescopes were employed by the ancient Egyptians and Chaldeans, before their temples, which were also their observatories, were pillaged or destroyed by the Persians. For my

own part I cannot doubt that the art of constructing telescopes was known to the philosophers of those countries ; but this art, with many others, was in great measure, though, I think, not entirely, lost, after the terrible reigns of Cambyses and Xerxes. All the learning of the East was confined to one class of men ; and the persecution of the Persians was chiefly directed against that class. Cambyses offended without injuring superstition, when he wounded the sacred bull ; but he gave a mortal blow to Egyptian science, when he compelled the priests to abandon their literary pursuits, by burning and pillaging the edifices consecrated to learning and religion. Neither could the conduct of Xerxes have produced any other effect in Chaldea, when he destroyed, according to Arrian, not only the temple itself (τὸν νεῶν) of Belus, but the other sacred places (τὰ ἄλλα ἱερὰ) of the Babylonians ; for by these other sacred places I understand the historian to mean the colleges, seminaries, and buildings inhabited by the priests, all of which were contained within the sacred precincts.

But let us now enquire, whether the ancients employed mirrors and telescopes in surveying the heavens, or whether the use of the telescope remained unknown until the 17th century.

The Greeks, as Plutarch attests, employed metallic mirrors, either plane, or convex, or concave, according to the uses for which they were intended. Every one has heard of the burning mirrors constructed by Archimedes. The Persian writers have preserved many curious traditions of the mirror of Alexander, (*Ayinah Iskandri*) in which they say, that the universe was represented. But it is certain from a passage in Aristotle, (*Meteorolog.* l. i. c. 8.) that the ancients employed mirrors in surveying the celestial appearances. Now this fact furnishes a strong presumptive proof of the use of magnifying glasses. M. Bailly, who denies that the Greek astronomers were acquainted with the use of the telescope, admits that they employed *alidades* in observing the stars. To these instruments tubes were affixed, though perhaps at first this might not have been the case. Now the question is, whether, or not, lenses were ever placed in these tubes. The use of glass was known from remote antiquity. Mention is made of glass in the book of Job, where it is called זכוכית. The Phœnicians, Egyptians, and Babylonians, knew not only the art of casting glass, but of colouring it. Bits of glass of different colors are still found upon the mummies. The cups, which Adrian sent from Egypt to Rome, were apparently of glass coloured in imitation of the opal. (Vopiscus.) In more ancient times the Tyrians and Babylonians constructed columns of glass, and gave a green tint of so much lustre to these

columns, that strangers mistook them, though many cubits in height, for single emeralds. (Herodot. l. ii. Theophrast. de lapid.) Glass was so common in Ethiopia, that according to Herodotus, coffins for the dead were frequently made of it. The Greeks knew how to melt and cast glass, for Plutarch mentions heath as the best kind of fuel to be employed for that purpose. Suidas, at the word *βαλος*, in explaining a passage in Aristophanes, indicates that burning mirrors were occasionally made of glass. The Greeks appear to have imitated precious stones in coloured crystals. (Plin. l. xxxvi. Theophrast. de lapid.) The Romans worked in glass with admirable skill; and in such abundance was glass at Rome, that it may be doubted whether any palace in Europe contain half as much glass as was exhibited in the theatre erected by Scaurus. The manner, in which the Romans coloured glass, has not been equalled by modern ingenuity. (Winkelman Hist. de l'art.) Seneca seems to exaggerate the proficiency made in working glass, and in imitating gems, during his own age. (Epist. 90.) The Romans might have improved in the art; but the manufacture of glass had been carried to high perfection by more ancient nations, as I have already shown. But if the ancients could do so much with glass, and possessed it in such abundance, they could scarcely have been ignorant of its magnifying powers. That the Romans must have known the magnifying powers of glass, may, I think, be concluded from the sense in which Seneca uses the word *specularia*. If the astronomers did not place lenses in the tubes of their alidades, how are we to understand Strabo, when he says, that vapours produce the same effects as the tubes in magnifying the objects of vision by refraction? (l. iii. c. 138.) This at least seems to me the sense of the passage. The language of Geminus (Uranolog. 10.) is not less remarkable, as cited by Bailly—*præterea etiam per dioptra omnes stellæ spectatæ videntur circularem motum in totâ circumductione dioptrorum*. The Romans were accustomed to survey minute objects through a glass bottle filled with water. (Sen. Quæst. Natur.) This was to know the powers of the microscope; and if the microscope were known, so probably was the telescope. Neither does the use of the telescope seem to have been lost in later times. About the end of the 12th century Averroes observed the transit of Mercury over the sun's disk, a task scarcely to be accomplished without the aid of a coloured magnifying glass. Towards the end of the 13th century flourished our countryman Roger Bacon. This extraordinary person asserted, that by means of glasses the sun and moon might be brought down to the earth; and he likewise said that Cæsar surveyed

the coast of Britain from that of Gaul, by the help of a glass; and this account, whether true or false, proves its author to have been acquainted with the use of the telescope.

My readers will now perhaps be more disposed to bear with me, when I express my belief, that telescopes were constructed in very remote ages by the Egyptians and Chaldeans. The Greeks reported that Pythagoras showed letters written on the disk of the moon by means of a mirror. How easily may this wonderful tale be explained, by supposing, that Pythagoras showed to his countrymen the inequalities on the surface of the lunar orb, through a telescope, which he had brought with him from Memphis or Babylon! It is mentioned by Diodorus Siculus, that the Hyperboreans had a tradition of mountains having been seen in the moon. Some stranger, having a telescope, may have wandered into those regions; and as barbarians are always more impressed by the phenomena of nature, than polished nations, it is not surprising that the remembrance of this spectacle, so astonishing to ignorant men, had not been lost even in the lapse of ages. Pliny states (l. ii.) that 1600 stars might be counted in the 72 constellations. He must have had this from Oriental tradition; for by the 72 constellations can only be understood the 72 parts into which the Orientalists divided the zodiac. But, according to Ptolemy, only 1022 (or 1026) stars can be discerned by the eye in the whole visible heavens. The Orientalists therefore must have employed magnifying glasses of great power, to have counted 1600 stars in the zodiac alone. In Flamstead's catalogue for the whole heavens, the number of stars counted amounts to no more than 3000; and I believe it has only been within the last 30 years, that this catalogue has been augmented. The celebrated Democritus asserted, that the galaxy is composed of a multitude of small stars. (Plutarch. de placit. philosophor.) It is only the telescope that could have divulged this secret of nature; and as Democritus had no means of making such a discovery himself, we may conclude that he had heard the fact stated in the East, where the memory of such an observation might have been still preserved. (430 years B. C.) It is still more remarkable, that the Persians, who could no more have made the discovery than the Greek philosopher, have made the same statement. Hyde, in his notes to the tables of Uleg Beig, cites a passage from the *Nimetullah*, in which it is said, that the galaxy appears white from the great multitude of stars which it contains. Now the Persians could not possibly have known this truth from observation. They could only have had it from tradition. Democritus affirmed that the whole number of the

planets was not known to the Greeks. This he must likewise have heard at Memphis or Babylon. Indeed the Chaldeans still held in the time of Apollonius of Pamphylia, (240 years B. C.) that more planets had been discovered than were generally known. (Senec. Quæst. Nat.) The followers of Buddha in India have an ancient tradition, that there is a planet, (I think they call it *Rayu*) the orbit of which is beyond the orbit of Saturn. Some of the ancient Bramins held the number of planets to be fifteen; and they consequently reckoned one more than the Europeans did, before Cassini, in the year 1684, had discovered the two interior satellites of Saturn.

I now leave it to my readers to decide, whether I be right or wrong, in concluding, that the use of the telescope must have been known from remote antiquity. Let us proceed to other considerations. We are told that the Egyptians were ignorant of the higher branches of mathematics. Yet when Plato reproved the mathematicians of his own age and country, for degrading their science by making it too material, it would seem that he must have heard in Egypt of some higher parts of mathematics than were cultivated by Eudoxus and Archytas. Plato's idea of this science must have been exalted indeed, and more so than his own knowledge of it could justify, when he said that God is always exercising geometry. From these circumstances I am induced to think that some traditions, some remnants of profound mathematical learning, had given Plato reason to believe, that the Egyptians had once gone far beyond the elementary parts of the science.

But we are likewise told that the Egyptians scarcely knew the elements of algebra. How can we be sure of this? If all their books, and the keys to their hieroglyphical symbols, were destroyed during the 40 years' persecution, as there is good reason to believe, how can we conclude that they knew not the use of algebra as completely as our modern mathematicians? It would be utterly unjust to decide the question from the specimens given by a Greek of the Alexandrian school, who wrote when science was nearly extinct among the native Egyptians, and who may have ill understood the ancient algebraical formulæ.

With respect to fluxions, the differential calculus, and logarithms, it is equally impossible to say, whether the ancient Egyptians were acquainted with them or not. One of the writers of the Asiatic Researches gives us reason to suppose, that the Bramins employed the differential calculus, and were acquainted with the binomial theorem. But in spite of all that has been said of the antiquity of Indian science,

I am still of opinion that it was all obtained, and imperfectly obtained, from the Chaldeans and Egyptians.

I am aware that I have trespassed beyond the usual bounds on the patience of my readers. I shall therefore compress my matter as much as possible, while I examine what remains to us of the astronomical knowledge of the ancient Egyptians and Chaldeans. If we find among these remnants various statements, which laborious investigation has demonstrated in later times to be consistent with fact, how shall we be justified in supposing that men, at one period rather than at another, have discovered the laws of nature without research, have found out the truth by guess, and have arrived at right conclusions by wrong inductions?

In considering then the fragments of this very ancient system of astronomy, the cycles first strike us with astonishment. The cycle of 19 years, the invention of which has been claimed for Meton by his countrymen, was known in the East for many centuries before he existed. (Bailly Hist. de l'Astron.) I conceive that the cycle of 60 years, which was thence called the *sosos* by the Chaldeans, was instituted to mark the periods of the planet Jupiter, and accordingly the Bramins denominated it the cycle of *Vrihaspati*. (Asiat. Research.) 60 of our years make, in round numbers, 5 years of Jupiter; and the planet setting out from *Aries*, at the beginning of the period, will be found in the same sign at its conclusion. According to Josephus, the *Neros*, consisting of 600 years, was established by the Antediluvians. Cassini shows that its inventors calculated the lunar month right to a second, but that they estimated the diurnal period at 24h. 51' 36", which is nearly 3' too long. If, however, the priests of Amoun were right, the Antediluvians may have been so likewise, for Plutarch tells us, that according to the former the annual period has been continually decreasing. In a former paper I have shown that the Egyptians knew the great period, in which the pole of the equator turns round the pole of the ecliptic. My readers may consult what M. Bailly has said concerning the two Oriental periods of 144 and of 180 years, and which multiplied into each other give 25,920 years, the exact period of the great cycle. M. Bailly tells us that the Indians call the period of 180 years *van*. He would have found his argument strengthened had he been aware that *van*, or *vahan*, signifies *vehicle*. Thus the period called *van* was not to be considered alone. It was the *vehicle* of another number, and that number being 144, and being multiplied by it, gives the number of years, in which the stars apparently make a complete revolution.

The Pythagoreans, who had derived all their knowledge from the East, held, according to Plutarch, (in vita Numæ) that the fire, (i. e. the sun) occupies the centre of the universe; that the earth is carried by a circular motion round the central fire; and that it is far from forming a principal part in the mundane system. "The Pythagoreans say, that the fire is in the middle, and that the earth is one of the stars, being carried round the centre, and thus producing night and day." (Aristot. de Cælo. l. ii.) "Philolaus, the Pythagorean, held that the earth moves round the sun in an oblique circle." (Plutarch de placit. philosophor.)

In the doctrines of the Pythagoreans we can distinctly trace their knowledge of the laws of attraction and repulsion, and of the continued action of the centripetal and centrifugal forces. It also appears to me, that gravitation must have formed the great pillar of the Pythagorean system. I think so, because several of the Greek philosophers, as is evident from Plutarch, were aware of the tendency of all material particles to a common centre. But my chief reason for thinking so is, because Aristotle combats the Pythagorean system; as being inconsistent with the laws of gravitation. "The mass of the earth," says he, "must be heavier than the mass of the fire, and therefore the earth, and not the fire, ought to occupy the centre of the universe." He therefore seems to attack the system, as being contrary to the very principles upon which it was established. Has Aristotle's argument been answered yet? I can have no doubt that the sun is in the centre of our universe; and yet it can hardly be denied that the specific gravity of our globe must be greater than that of a globe of fire, though that may be greater by a million times than the earth.

But this Pythagorean system had its origin in Egypt and the East. Who but the Chaldeans and Egyptians taught the Greeks to calculate eclipses? According to Diogenes Laertius the Egyptians had already observed, before the time of Alexander, 373 eclipses of the sun, and 832 of the moon. From the same sources the Greeks must have obtained their notions of a plurality of worlds. (Plutarch. de cess. Orac.) Aristotle says, (Meteorolog. l. i.) "that the Pythagoreans held a comet to be one of the planets, which appears after a long interval of time, and which, at the apex of its very elliptical orbit, is at as small a distance from the sun as the planet Mercury." This seems to me to be the sense of the passage. Now the Chaldeans held comets to be planets: (Senec. quæst. Nat.) and the Egyptians predicted their returns. (Diodor. l. i.) The Greeks have stated with tolerable exactness, though in round numbers, the annual periods of the planets.

(Plut. de placit. philosophor.) But they had probably obtained their information concerning the planetary system from the Egyptians, who had already explained, (the most difficult part of that system,) the motions of the planets Mercury and Venus. (Macrob. in somn. Scipion. l. i.) From what sources, unless from Oriental traditions, could the Greeks have derived their knowledge, when they taught that the moon's diameter is about a third of the earth's? (this computation makes the moon's diameter too great, but still it is true that the moon's diameter is greater than a fourth of the earth's;)—that the moon's mass is to that of the earth as 1 to 72? (this is within one of Bernoulli's calculation;) and that the diameter of the sun is equal to the 725th part of his orbit? Where but at Memphis, or at Babylon, could Pythagoras, or Democritus, have learned that the moon might be a habitable world like our own; and that its surface like that of the earth is diversified with mountains, valleys, and seas? (Plutarch. de facie in orbe lunæ, Stob. l. i.) Empedocles must have heard it as the opinion of those who had tried to take the parallax of the fixed stars, that their distances are incalculable. Aristarchus taught that the earth turns round its own axis, and moves in the oblique circle of the zodiac, while the heavens are at rest. This was much; but he also affirmed that the sun was one of the fixed stars. I may be told that these were all guesses; but it could scarcely have been guess-work, when the same Aristarchus declared the distance of the moon from the earth to be equal to 56 demi-diameters of the earth—that is, 220,360 English miles. The real distance is 240,000 English miles. Now as Aristarchus could not have made this calculation himself, (for he could not take the parallax of a planet, as Hipparchus did after him,) he must have had it from Oriental tradition. We learn from Seneca, that Artemidorus asserted that innumerable planets, invisible to man, wander through the boundless regions of space. But Artemidorus, who was a poor astronomer himself, must have heard this as the opinion of men, who believed from analogical reasoning, that other earths turn round other suns—and these men could scarcely have been found among his own contemporaries. (100 y. B. C.) But the most extraordinary statement made by any ancient astronomer, was that of Eratosthenes, (Plutarch de placit. philosophor. l. ii. c. 31. Xylander's edition) who said that the sun is 804,000,000 stadia from the earth. M. Bailly computes this distance to be equal to 202,000 demi-diameters of the earth. In English miles this will amount to 79,487,000, which was nearly the distance determined by Cassini, 81,000,000.

But it seems to me, that M. Bailly has made the stadium here much too short. In the next part of this Essay, I shall explain myself fully

concerning the stadium, and its rates of measure. In the mean time I shall merely observe, that there is no reason for thinking, that Eratosthenes meant any other stadium in this calculation, than the stadium of 600 Greek feet, commonly named the Olympic stadium. I think it right however to remark, that the length of this stadium is inaccurately given in all the treatises on itinerary measures which I have seen, because it has not been considered that there was a long Greek foot, which exceeded the English by almost half an inch; and which ought not to be confounded with that which is said to bear to the English foot the proportion of 1007 to 1000. It can be shown that this long foot was that which was reckoned to the Olympic stadium, which I hold to have been about $624\frac{3}{4}$ English feet in length. If then we reckon by this stadium, we shall find the calculation, probably reduced by Eratosthenes to the Greek standard, from Chaldean or Egyptian measures, very surprising. Modern astronomers compute the distance of the earth from the sun at 95,173,000 English miles. The computation of Eratosthenes gives the distance at about 95,193,000 English miles. It is clear, that this statement could not have been founded on conjecture; and while it affords an astonishing proof of astronomical skill, we cannot doubt, that Eratosthenes reported it on the authority of Oriental tradition. I must yet request the attention of my readers to another most extraordinary statement. I mean the measure of the earth's circumference, as reported by Aristotle to have been made by the mathematicians. (*De Cælo* l. ii.) This measure is given at 400,000 stadia. M. Bailly has written at great length upon this subject; and though by a different process I have come to the same conclusion with that ingenious writer, I am aware, that the existence of a stadium of $51\frac{1}{2}$ toises, equal to about 330 short Greek feet, has been disputed. My reasons for admitting it will be stated in my next communication; in which I shall endeavour to show, that there existed in Egypt and the East an itinerary measure precisely of the length which I have mentioned. Aristotle says, that the circumference of the earth was stated at 400,000 stadia. Now what mathematicians did Aristotle mean? Surely not those of Greece. In the time of Aristotle the mathematicians of Greece were incapable of making any calculation concerning the earth's circumference; but Aristotle, who was informed of the state of the sciences at Babylon by Calisthenes, and probably by other Greeks who accompanied Alexander, might very well have known the traditions preserved on this subject by the Chaldeans. Now the short stadium of 330 feet was, as I shall show, a Chaldean measure; and for reasons, which I have not now time to adduce, I calculate this stadium at 330 short Greek feet. My

opinion is, that the excess of this small foot above the English foot was even less than Mr. Greaves has made it. That writer rates the excess at about the 143rd part of a foot. My calculation makes this excess still less—the 658th part and a fraction of a foot. Now if the small stadium consisted of 330 small Greek feet of the dimensions which I have calculated, the result will be found very remarkable. The circumference of the earth is determined at 25,038 English miles, or at 132,200,640 English feet. If we reckon the small stadium at 330 small Greek feet, then 400,000 stadia will be equal 132,000,000 of these Greek feet. Were these Greek feet precisely of the same measure with as many English feet, the whole would amount to precisely 25,000 English miles; but I have stated this small Greek foot to be longer than the English by the 658th part and a fraction of a foot. This may appear a very trifling difference; and yet in the circumference of the earth it will amount to 200,640 English feet or 38 English miles; and thus will 132,000,000 of these Greek feet, be precisely equal 132,200,640 English feet; and 400,000 Chaldean stadia will be equal to 25,038 English miles, the exact measure of the earth's circumference. I now leave the subject for the present, and regret that I have detained my readers so long; though I have endeavoured to be as concise as possible.

Paris, July 1817.

W. DRUMMOND.

REMARKS ON THE DÆMON OF SOCRATES.

As the dogmas of the ancient philosophers have been but little understood since the abolition of their schools, they have been for the most part grossly perverted, or ignorantly opposed. We have an egregious instance of this in what is transmitted to us by Plato and Xenophon respecting the celebrated dæmon of Socrates, of which the general opinion has been, that it was the prudence, foresight, or conscience of Socrates, unaccompanied with any supernatural agency. The following testimonies, however, from Plato will, I doubt not, convince the intelligent reader that Socrates firmly believed he was under the immediate protection of a power, superior to man, but inferior to God; that this power was a dæmon, or in modern language a guardian angel; and that it was not merely, as Mr. Nares asserts, *a voice*, but that it was *the voice of a dæmon*.

In the first place, it is requisite to observe of the adjective δαιμόνιον, that though it frequently signifies *divine*, yet its primary signification is *dæmoniack*. Hence it is usual with all the disciples of Plato to call their master θεῖος *divine*, and Aristotle δαιμόνιος, taking occasion thus to denominate the latter from what Plato said of him, that he was δαίμων φύσεως, *the dæmon of nature*, from his uncommon knowledge in every branch of physiology.

In the second place, that every man has a dæmon who attends him while living, and conducts him to his judges when he dies, is expressly asserted by Socrates in the Phædo : λέγεται δὲ οὕτως, ὡς ἄρα τελευτήσαντα ἕκαστον, ὃ ἑκάστου δαίμων ὅπερ ζῶντα εἰλήχει, οὗτος ἄγειν ἐπιχειρεῖ εἰς δὴ τίνα τόπον, κ. λ.

In the third place, δαιμόνιον in Plato, is not, as Mr. Nares supposes, always an adjective supported by τι, as is evident from the following instances from the Theages and Theætetus : ὅτι λέγοντός σου μεταξὺ γέγονέ μοι ἡ φωνὴ ἡ τοῦ δαιμονίου.—ἐνίοις μὲν τὸ γιγνόμενόν μοι δαιμόνιον ἀποκωλύει συνεῖναι, ἐνίοις δὲ ἔ᾿. From the former of these extracts also, it is evident that the δαιμόνιον of Socrates was not merely a voice, but the voice of a dæmon. For as there is a substantive δαιμόνιον, this word, when unaccompanied with τι, and particularly when preceded by the article τὸ, is doubtless to be considered as a substantive. But as Socrates also calls this τὸ δαιμόνιον, a God, in consequence of being, as Proclus observes, a dæmon of the highest order, it is indubitably certain that this word is used by him in the above passages as a substantive. He calls it a God, however, in the first Alcibiades : διὸ δὴ καὶ πάλαι οἶμαί με τὸν θεὸν οὐκ ἔ᾿ν διαλέγεσθαι σοι, ὃν ἐγὼ περιεμένον ὀπηνίκα ἑάσει. And also in the Theætetus : τὸ δὲ αἴτιον τούτου τὸδε· μαιεύεσθαι με ὁ θεὸς ἀναγκάζει, γένναν δὲ ἀπεκάλυσεν.—τῆς μέντοι μαιείας ὁ θεὸς τε καὶ ἐγὼ αἴτιος.

It would be in vain to observe to Mr. Nares, that the greater part, and the best of the disciples of Plato, agree with Mr. Heber, that “Socrates was attended by one of those beings superior to man, whom, under the name of dæmon, they were accustomed from their infancy to fear, propitiate, and adore.” For he says, “What others have made of δαιμόνιον is of no consequence.” As if the opinion of men was of no consequence, with whom the Greek language was their native tongue ; who made the study of

the philosophy of Plato the business of their lives ; and who had books to consult, written by his immediate disciples, which since their time have been irrecoverably lost. Or as if the decision of Dr. Enfield, Dr. Hay, Bishop Horsley, Mr. Mitford, and Schweighæuser, on this subject, was of greater authority than that of Plutarch, Apuleius, and Proclus.

To other learned readers, indeed, it will most clearly appear from the *Apology* of Socrates, written by Plato, that Socrates was accused of impiety, and of making innovations in the religion of his country, for asserting that he was connected in a very transcendent degree with a presiding dæmon, to whose direction he confidently submitted the conduct of his life. For the accusation of Melitus, that he introduced other *novel demoniacal* natures, (καινὰ δαιμόνια), can admit of no other construction. This is evident from what is said by Xenophon, whose testimony on this point is no less weighty than decisive : “ I have often wondered,” says that historian and philosopher, “ by what arguments the Athenians, who condemned Socrates, persuaded the city that he was worthy of death. For, in the first place, how could they prove that he did not believe in the Gods in which the city believed ? since it was evident that he often sacrificed at home, and often on the common altars of the city. It was also not unapparent that he employed divination. For a report was circulated that signals were given to Socrates, according to his own assertion, by a dæmoniacal power ; whence they especially appear to me to have accused him of introducing new dæmoniacal natures. He, however, introduced nothing new, nor any thing different from the opinion of those who, believing in divination, make use of auguries and oracles, symbols and sacrifices. For these do not apprehend that either birds, or things which occur, know what is advantageous to the diviners ; but they are of opinion that the Gods thus signify to them what is beneficial ; and he also thought the same.”

Πολλάκις ἐθαύμασα, τίσι ποτὲ λόγοις Ἀθηναίους ἔπεισαν οἱ γραψάμενοι Σωκράτην, ὡς ἄξιός εἴη θανάτου τῇ πόλει.—πρῶτον μὲν οὖν ὡς οὐκ ἐνόμιζεν οὓς ἡ πόλις νομίζει θεοὺς, ποῖω ποτ' ἐχρήσαντο τεκμηρίω ; θύων τε γὰρ φανερὸς ἦν πολλάκις μὲν οἴκοι, πολλάκις δὲ ἐπὶ τῶν κοινῶν τῆς πόλεως βωμῶν καὶ μαντικῇ χρώμενος οὐκ ἀφανὴς ἦν διστεθερύλλητο γὰρ, ὡς φαίη Σωκράτης τὸ δαιμόνιον ἑαυτῷ σημαίνειν, ὅθεν δὴ καὶ μάλιστα

μοι δοκοῦσιν αὐτὸν αἰτιάσασθαι, καινὰ δαιμόνια εἰσφέρειν· ὁ δ' οὐδὲν καινόμενον εἰσέφερε τῶν ἄλλων, ὅσοι μαντικὴν νομίζοντες, οἰωνοῖς τε χρώνται, καὶ φήμαις, καὶ συμβόλοις, καὶ θυσίαις· οὗτοί τε γὰρ ὑπολαμβάνουσιν, οὐ τοὺς ὄρνιθας, οὐδὲ τοὺς ἀπαντῶντας, εἰδέναι τὰ συμφέροντα τοῖς μαντευομένοις, ἀλλὰ τοὺς θεοὺς διὰ τούτων αὐτὰ σημαίνειν· κἀκεῖνος οὕτως ἐνόμιζεν. And in another place he observes, "That it was evident that Socrates worshipped the Gods the most of all men." Φανερὸς ἦν θεραπεύων τοὺς θεοὺς, μάλιστα τῶν ἄλλων ἀνθρώπων.

Conformably to this, in his *Apology* written by Plato, he clearly says, that the doctrine of Anaxagoras, which made the sun and moon to be no Gods, is *absurd*. And in another part of it: "I believe that there are Gods more than any one of my accusers." καὶ ἀτέχνως ἀπολογούμενος κατηγοροῖν ἂν ἑαυτοῦ, ὥς θεοὺς οὐ νομίζω· ἀλλὰ πολλοῦ δεῖ οὕτως ἔχειν· νομίζω τε γὰρ, ὧ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, ὥς οὐδεὶς τῶν ἐμῶν κατηγορῶν.

If Socrates therefore was a believer in the religion of his country, as he most unquestionably was, he believed that he was attended by a friendly *dæmon*; and this being one of the most exalted kind, he not only calls it τὸ δαιμόνιον, but also θεός. For agreeably to the theology of the Greeks, as the summit of an inferior coalesces with the extremity of a proximately inferior order, the highest *dæmon* is κατὰ σχέσιν, through habitude or alliance, a God.

I had almost forgot to observe that this voice, which Socrates heard, is called by him in the *Apology* a *prophetic voice*, ἡ γὰρ εἰωθυῖά μοι μαντικὴ, ἡ τοῦ δαιμονίου. And prophecy, according to Plato, is under the *immediate* superintendence of *dæmons*, as is evident from the speech of Diotima in the *Banquet*.

After such unequivocal testimony, no other reason can be assigned for the position of the moderns, that Socrates ridiculed the religion of his country, than inattention to one of the most important tenets of ancient theology, and which may also be considered as ranking among the first of the most magnificent, scientific, and divine conceptions of the human mind. The tenet I allude to is, that the essential, which is the most perfect energy of deity, is *deific*; and that his first and immediate progeny must as necessarily be Gods, that is, beings transcendently similar to himself, and possessing those characteristics *secondarily* which he possesses *primarily*, as heat is the immediate offspring of fire,

and coldness of snow. Unacquainted with this mighty truth, which is coeval with the universe itself, modern theologists and sophists have defamed what they did not understand, and by offering violence to the pages of venerable antiquity, have made the great Socrates himself become the patron of their own distorted conceptions.

Manor Place, Walworth.

THOMAS TAYLOR.

STANLEII NOTÆ QUÆDAM IN CALLIMACHUM.

THESE Notes, it appears from some rudiments (greatly varied by corrections and interlineations) to have been the writer's intention to inscribe,

Clarissimo
ac
Eruditissimo Viro,
JOHANNI MARSHAM,
Armigero, &c.

They are much intermingled with additional remarks by Bowyer, into whose possession they seem to have passed; and here and there I have presumed, very slightly, to play the commentator myself. As, from my sequestered situation, I have no easy means of ascertaining whether or not the annotations of S. and B. have been already communicated, in some shape or other, to the public, I trust I shall be forgiven, even if I should appear to students more fortunately circumstanced in that particular, to have "found a mare's nest."

Yours very truly,

Hunmanby, June 23, 1817.

F. WRANGHAM.

N. B. I only insert occasionally the Bowyer additions, of which the Greek passages (I may add) are, contrary to those of Stanley, generally accented.

IN HYMN. I. Εἰς Δία.

1. Ζηγὸς εἰς.] A short note crossed, either as made use of, or rejected.

6. Ἰδαίοισιν ἐν οὐρεσι.] Schol. Ἰδὴ ὄρος Κρήτης καὶ Τροίας, νῦν δὲ τὸ Κρήτης φασί· nec ab hac certatione omnino excludenda est Ida Trojana. Schol. Apollonii. Ἀντρω ἐν Ἰδαίῳ, τῷ τῆς Κρήτης ἢ τῷ τῆς Τροίας· ἀντιποιοῦνται γὰρ καὶ Τρῶες τῆς τοῦ Διὸς γενέσεως.

8. ——— καὶ γὰρ τάφον, ὃ ἄνα, σεῖο

Κρήτες ἐτεκτῆναντο———]

Clem. Alexandr. Strom. Ζήτει σοῦ τὸν Δία, μὴ τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀλλὰ τὴν γῆν πολυπραγμόνει· Ὁ Κρῆς σοι διηγῆσεται, παρ' ᾧ καὶ τέθαιπται· deinde profert hunc ipsum Callimachi versum. (S.) Luciani Timon. Εἰ μὴ ἀληθὴ ἐστὶ τὰ ὑπὸ Κρήτων περὶ σου καὶ τῆς σῆς ταφῆς μυθολογούμενα.

21. — ὅτ' ἐλύσατο μήτρην.] Λύουσι γὰρ τὰς ζώνας αἱ πρῶτως τίκτουσαι, καὶ ἀνατιθέασιν Ἀρτέμιδι· ὅθεν καὶ Λυσιζώνης Ἀρτέμιδος ἱερὸν ἐν Ἀθήναις. (B.)

25. — κινώπετα.] 9. κινώπεδα, τὰ θηρία τὰ χερσαῖα, παρὰ τὸ ἐν ἰδάρει ἢ πεδίῳ κινεῖσθαι. Sic apud Oppianum κνώδαλα vocantur belluæ marinæ, τὰ ἐν τῇ ἀλὶ κινούμενα ζῶα.

60. Δηναίοι.] Tritum proverbium, πολλὰ ψεύδονται ἄοιδοι, quod et Plato habet, et Aristoteles, lib. i. Metaphys. Auson. Epigr. de Didone, *Fatidici vates, temerant qui carmine verum.* Apud Suidam gravissimè quidam Ἡ τοῦ ψεύδους λοχεύτρια ποίησις, ἡ τῶν Ἑλληνικῶν ληρημάτων σεμνομυθία, &c. Plin. Jun. lib. ix. epist. 33. *Quid poetæ cum fide?* et lib. vi. epist. 21. *Poetis mentiri licet.* Multa in hanc sententiam et Cicero, Tuscul. Quæst., Lactant. Firmian. Institutionib., et Philo ἐν τῷ περὶ ἀφθαρσ. κόσμου habent. Euripid., Herc. Furens, Ἀοιδῶν οἷδε δύστηνοι λόγοι.

63. Ἰσαίη,] pro Ἰση· eâdem facie Pindarus ἀρχαῖαν pro ἀρχὴν dixit, et δίκαιαν pro δίκην.

48. ——— σὺ δ' ἐθήσαο πόνα μαζόν

Αἰγὸς Ἀμαλθείης, ἐπὶ δὲ γλυκὺ κηρίον ἔβρωσ.]

Lactant. lib. xxii. Didymus in libris ἐξηγήσεως Πινδαρικῆς ait, Melissea Cretensium regem primum Diis sacrificâsse, et ritus novos sacrorumque pompas introduxisse : hujus duas fuisse filias, Amaltheam et Melissam, quæ Jovem puerum caprino lacte ac melle

nutrierunt, unde poetica illa fabula originein sumpsit, advolâsse apes atque os pueri melle complêsse.

52. Οὐλα δὲ Κούρητές σε περὶ πρύλιν ὠρχήσαντο,
Τεύχεα πεπλήγοντες]

Κουρήτω νένοπλια παίγνια memorat Plato de Legib. lib. iii. (S.) Confer In Dianam, v. 240. cum Ritterhusii correctione Ουλα, Lambin. in Hor. Od. I. 16., Claudian. de 4 Consulatu. Hon.

*Nec te progenitum Cybeleius ære sonoro
Lustravit Corybus.*

53. ——— ἵνα Κρόνος οὔασιν ἤχην
Ἀσπίδος εἰσαῖτοι, καὶ μή σεο κουρίζοντος.]

Germanicus :

*Quod fidæ comites, primò incunabula magni
Fuderunt Jovis attonitæ cùm furta parentis,
Ærea pulsantes mendaci cymbala dextrâ,
Vagitus pueri patrias ne tangeret aures,
Dictæi exercent (Barth. tegerent) dominæ famuli Corybantes.*

30. Εἶπε, καὶ ἀντανύσασα θεὰ μέγαν ὑψόθι πῆχυν
Πλήξεν ὄρος σκήπτρῳ· τὸ δέ οἱ δίχα πολὺ διέστη,
Ἐκ δ' ἔχεεν μέγα χεῦμα.]

Pulchrè hæc respondent illi SS. Scripturæ, Num. 10, 11. Deinde Mosches, attollens manum suam, percussit illam petram virgâ suâ bis : tunc prodiit aqua multa. Claud. de Rapt. Proserp. lib. 2.

——— *trifidâ Neptunus cuspide montes
Impulit adversos ; tum forti saucius ictu
Dissiluit gelido vertex Ossæus Olympo :
Carceribus laxantur aquæ.*

et

——— *immenso latè discessit hiatu.* (ib.)

34. Κευθμὸν ἔσω Κρηταῖον.]

Apollon. lib. 2.

——— Ὁ δὲ Κρηταῖον ἐπ' ἄντρον,
Ζεὺς ἔτι κουρήτεσσι μετετρέφετ' Ἰδαίοισι. (S.)

Myro Poetria :

Ζεὺς δ' ἄρ' ἐνὶ Κρήτῃ τράφετο μέγας, οὐδ' ἄρα τίς νιν
Ἡῆδαι μακάρων· ὁ δ' ἀέξετο πᾶσι μέλεσσι.
Τὸν μὲν ἄρα τρήρωνες ὑπὸ ζαθέῳ τρέφον ἄντρῳ.

Minut. Felix Octav. Adhuc antrum visitur Jovis, et sepulchrum ejus ostenditur. Barth. in Claud. 113.

47. ——— σὲ δὲ κοίμισεν Ἀδρήστεια.]

Apollon. lib. 3.

Κεῖνο τό οἱ ποίησε φίλη τροφὸς Ἀδρήστεια

Ἀντρωῶ ἐν Ἰδαίῳ ἔτι νήπια κουρίζοντι. (S.)

Rectè Vulcanius *sopivit*, non *circumgestavit*, ut Frischl.

8. Κρῆτες αἰὲ ψευσταί, κ. τ. λ.

D. Hieron. in Epistolam ad Titum: Sunt qui putent hunc versum de Callimacho Cyrenensi poetâ sumtum, et aliquâ ex parte non errant: Siquidem et ipse in Laudibus Jovis adversus Cretenses scriptitans, qui sepulchrum ejus se ostendere gloriabantur, ait *Cretenses semper mendaces, qui et sepulchrum ejus sacrilegâ mente fabricati sunt.* Verùm, ut supra diximus, integer versus de Epimenide poetâ ab Apostolo sumtus est, et ejus Callimachus in suo poemate est usus exordio; sive vulgare proverbium, quo Cretenses appellabantur, sive furto alieni operis in metrum retulit. S. Chrysostomus a mente Scholiastæ discedit, qui ita in Hom. 3. in Ep. ad Titum; Οἱ Κρῆτες τάφον ἔχουσι τοῦ Διὸς, ἐπιγράφοντα τοῦτο, Ἐνταῦθα Ζᾶν κεῖται ὃν Δία κικλήσκουσι διὰ ταύτην τὴν ἐπιγραφὴν ὁ ποιήτης ψευστὰς τοὺς Κρῆτας καμωδῶν, &c.

Hujus sepulchri et inscriptionis meminit Porphyrius de Vitâ Pythagoræ, quem sis adeas; et Lucianus in Sacrificiis, Κρῆτες οὐ γενέσθαι παρ' αὐτοῖς, οὐδὲ ταφῆναι μόνον τὸν Δία λέγουσιν, ἀλλὰ τὸν τάφον αὐτοῦ δεικνύουσι: et idem in Φιλοψευδ. 3. εἰ Κρῆτες μὲν τοῦ Διὸς τάφον δεικνύοντες οὐκ αἰσχύνονται.

CAMBRIDGE PRIZE POEMS.

JERUSALEM.

My Spirit some transporting Cherub feels
To bear me where the towers of Salem stood,
Once glorious towers, now sunk.—

MILTON'S *Ode on the Passion.*

FLUSH'D with her crimes, and swol'n with impious pride,
Rebellious Judah still her God defied:
Then on Isaiah's eye prophetic rose
The lengthen'd vision of her future woes;

Then, with his country's fearful fate imprest,
 The sacred fervour labouring in his breast,
 Against the guilty race his kindling lyre
 Breathed the deep vengeance of th' Almighty's ire.

"Hear,¹ O ye Heav'ns, and thou, O Earth, give ear,
 And trembling shrink the awful sounds to hear!
 The Lord—the Lord hath spoken from on high,
 Whose voice is fate, whose will is destiny.
 See² from afar the dread avengers come,
 Fierce as despair, insatiate as the tomb.
 Heard ye their wheels, like whirlwinds, sweep around?
 Heard ye their thundering coursers beat the ground?
 Mark'd ye their spears move on in long array,
 And shield on shield flash back the beam of day?
 O'er³ Salem's walls Destruction sternly low'rs,
 And frowns dark horror on her destin'd towers.
 Bow'd to the dust,⁴ she mourns her slaughter'd bands,
 And strives in vain to lift her fetter'd hands."

O greatly-fall'n, how humbled is thy state!
 Thy fields how bare, thy courts how desolate!
 Where Joy was wont the nightly dance to lead,
 Shrieks the lone bat, and hungry vultures feed;
 There the fierce dragon finds a place of rest,
 And boding screech-owls build their secret nest.
 No more, Bethesda, o'er thy desert springs
 Descending Seraphs wave their healing wings;
 No more sweet sounds, at morn, or eve, declare
 That hosts angelic hover on the air:
 All—all is fled; and Desolation reigns,
 Without a rival, o'er thy ravaged plains.

O days divine, of you may mortal sing,
 When God himself was Israel's Guard and King?
 Will not the eloquence of earthly speech
 Fail from a height, which fancy scarce can reach?
 To know Creation's Monarch ever nigh,
 A staff in sorrow, and a friend in joy;
 To see Heav'n's glories visibly displayed,
 And all its Seraphim in light arrayed;
 These were thy rights, O Israel, this thy boast,
 These the high joys, thy disobedience lost.

Bear witness, Hermon, thou, whose dewy sod
 Has felt the footstep of a present God;

¹ Isai. i. 2.

³ Id. xxix. 3.

² Id. v. 26. &c. and xxix. 6.

⁴ Id. 4th verse.

And, Carmel, thou, whose gales, with incense fraught,
The murmurs of a voice divine have caught ;
What dreams extatic o'er the vot'ry stole,
How swell'd the pious transport in his soul !
E'en now, when o'er your long-forsaken sweets
The Pilgrim lingers, in your loved retreats,
Steal visionary forms along the vale,
And more than music whispers on the gale.

O had I pinions, ¹ fleet as those that bear
The dove exulting thro' the realms of air,
Then would I visit every holy shade,
Where Saints have knelt, or Prophets musing stray'd ;
Bend with a sigh o'er every relic near,
And pay each shrine the tribute of a tear.

Where o'er the waste, in rude disorder thrown,
Neglected lie yon crumbling heaps of stone,
O who (sad change!) the blest abode could tell,
Where God's own glory once vouchsafed to dwell ?
Yet from the ruins Fancy still can raise
Th' imperial structure, bright beneath her rays ;
Swift to the view its scatter'd wealth restore,
And bid its vanish'd splendors beam once more.
Ev'n as I gaze, ² the sudden spires ascend,
With graceful sweep the long-row'd arches bend ;
Aspiring shafts the heaving dome sustain,
And all the fabric grows along the plain.
See, as it rises, see the world combine
Its various gifts to deck the work divine :
Nature no more her secret treasures hides,
The mine uncloses, and the deep divides.
Mild o'er the wave the fav'ring breezes play,
And waft the Tyrian purple on its way.
Her purest marble rocky Paros lends,
Her sweetest odours soft Idumè blends ;
On Carmel's heights the stately cedar falls,
And Ophir sparkles on the polish'd walls.
See, while the slow-expanding gates unclose,
How bright within the boundless lustre glows !
Here the tall palm for ever lives in gold,
There sculptur'd flowers their fretted leaves unfold ;
While ever-burning lamps depend from high,
Countless as stars, that throng the midnight sky.

¹ Psalm lv. 6.

² 1 Kings, ch. vi. passim.

But far within retires the dread abode,
 Jehovah's throne—the Oracle of God ;
 Two cherubs there, with mimic glories bright,
 High o'er the Ark their guardian wings unite.

Thine were these mighty works, by thee design'd,
 Belov'd of God, and wisest of mankind.
 What ¹ to thy Sire the will of Heav'n denied,
 To thee it gave, propitious, to provide.
 Yet, while thy temple in the dust decays,
 Lives the full splendor of his sacred lays.
 O skill'd to strike the many-sounding lyre,
 With all a Prophet's—all a Poet's fire,
 What breast, that does not kindle at thy strain?
 What heart, that melts not, when thy strings complain?
 Hark, how the notes in mournful cadence sigh,
 Soft as the breeze, that only wakes to die.
 Changed is their tone; th' impetuous measures sweep,
 Like the fierce storm conflicting with the deep.
 Now all th' angelic host at once combine
 Their golden harps in unison with thine.
 Extatic fervors seize the trembling soul,
 And Halleluiahs ring from pole to pole.

What ² fearful omens heralded the hour,
 That gave Judæa to a tyrant's power!
 As sank the sun, amid the western blaze
 Terrific visions burst upon the gaze.
 Unearthly spears reflect the setting beam,
 Swords wave, helmets glitter, hostile standards stream;
 And thronging chariots, hurrying swiftly by,
 Sweep the wide air, 'till darkness veils the sky.
 Nor ceased the portents then: a lurid light
 Shot a fierce splendor from the clouds of night;
 Its own sad hue o'er all the temple spread,
 And on each fear-struck face a ghastlier paleness shed.

See! see! untouch'd by any human hand,
 The temple's gates—her massy gates—expand!
 No earthly sound is that within I hear,
 As waters bursting on the deafen'd ear,
 Proclaiming, as its awful thunders swell,
 "The Lord no more in Israel deigns to dwell:"
 No mortal foot th' affrighted threshold trod—
 'Tis God's own voice, the parting step of God!

¹ 2 Sam. vii. 4.² Josephi Hist. and Tacit. lib. v. c. 13.

Yes, thou art now abandon'd to thy fate ;
Vain is regret, repentance comes too late.
Already onward rush thy angry foes,
Already thy devoted walls enclose :
Death with pleased eye pursues their destined way,
And grim Destruction leads them to their prey.

Darker, and darker still thy doom appears,
And Sorrow's face a blacker aspect wears.
In vain with equal hand does Justice deal
To each the stinted, and unjoyous meal ;
With looks despairing, as they ask for food,
Breaks one shrill shriek from all the multitude :
No more remains to fan life's feeble fires,
And Hope's last throb just flutters, and expires.
Ev'n the fond mother, seized with madness wild,
While in her arms th' unconscious infant smiled,
Drove to its heart the unrelenting steel,
And quench'd her fury on th' accursed meal.

Amid the battle's fierce, conflicting storm,
Death veils the terrors of his awful form :
There, e'en if Victory smile not, Glory's beam
Casts a clear light on life's last ebbing stream.
But, worn by wasting famine, to decay,
Hour after hour, by slow degrees away ;
No cheering hope, no glowing pulse to feel,
No kindling fervor of exalted zeal ;
Sunk in despair, to wish, yet fear to die,
This—this is death, in all its agony !

Yet, worn by hunger, and opprest with ill,
Thy hardy sons remain unconquer'd still.
Weakness and Strength alike their weapons wield,
And they, who cannot conquer, scorn to yield.

Hark, how without the deafening tumult grows,
How swell the shouts of thy victorious foes !
Behold, ten thousand torches, hurl'd on high,
Gleam o'er the walls, and seem to fire the sky.
Now, Salem, now, the spreading flame devours
Thy homes, thy temple, and thy headlong towers :
Now Vengeance smiling scours th' ensanguined plain,
And waves her pinions o'er thy countless slain.

'Tis done ; proud Salem smokes along the ground,
Her pow'r a dream, her name an empty sound.
To other realms, from Sion far away,
In mute despair, her last sad remnant stray ;

While all the wounds of unrelenting hate,
 Beneath their foes, her captive sons await ;
 With no kind care their inward throes to heal,
 While insult sharpens ev'ry pang they feel.

Yet say, base outcasts of offended Heav'n,
 Rebelling still as often as forgiv'n,
 Say are the woes, that now your race pursue,
 More than your crimes, or heavier than your due ?
 How oft your God has turn'd his wrath away,
 How oft in mercy has forborne to slay !
 How long ¹ by gentle chastisement he strove
 To win once more his people to his love !
 Ah, call to mind, when in a distant land
 Forlorn ye bow'd beneath a stranger's hand,
 His hot displeasure on your haughty foes
 Pour'd the full tempest of unsparing woes.
 Then, as his flock the tender shepherd leads
 To softer herbage, and more fertile meads,
 He led his chosen people far away,
 Their guide in darkness, their defence by day.
 Lo, at his word th' obedient depths divide,
 And whelm th' Egyptian in their reflux tide ;
 While rescued Israel, free from every care,
 Gains the wish'd bank, and pours the vocal prayer.
 From the cleft rock see sudden rills rebound,
 And spread fresh verdure o'er the thirsty ground !
 Yet still anew your disobedience sprung,
 And discontent still murmur'd on your tongue ;
 To graven idols still the knee ye bow'd,
 And join'd in Baal's courts th' incestuous crowd.
 Still in your pride ye mock'd the threatening Seer,
 As the deaf adder shuts her reckless ear ;
 Plung'd in the Prophet's breast th' unhallow'd sword,
 And dared to slay the chosen of the Lord.

Swift into light th' expected years roll on,
 Th' Almighty Father sends his promised Son.
 Not as when Sinai view'd the law reveal'd
 In fearful lightning, and in thunder seal'd ;
 Now peaceful omens cheer the drooping earth,
 And hail the tidings of the Heav'nly birth.
 'Twas ² in the solemn stillness of the night,
 When the mild moon diffused her cloudless light ;

¹ Psalm cv. and cvi. passim.

² Luke ii. 9, 9, 10.

When all the wearied world lay hush'd in sleep,
 The wakeful shepherds watch'd their folded sheep.
 Clad in the radiant glory of the skies,
 A form angelic burst upon their eyes ;
 And, slowly stealing on their wond'ring ear,
 Rose the glad sounds, 'twas Heav'n itself to hear.
 " Joy to the world ! ye nations cease to mourn,
 " Now is the Christ, the promis'd Saviour born !"
 And, lo, descending, the celestial train
 Swell the full chorus of the rapt'rous strain ;
 Till on the gale the notes departing die,
 And all the vision melts into the sky.

Did ye not then with bursts of transport raise
 The loud hosannah of exulting praise ?
 With trembling homage round his cradle bend,
 Watch every look, and every smile attend ;
 And all Creation's noblest gifts combine
 To form an off'ring for the Babe divine ?
 Or, when, his mortal part matured to man,
 His earthly ministry at length began,
 Did ye not crowd his heav'nly words to hear,
 And drink instruction with delighted ear ?
 No—harden'd still your stubborn souls remain,
 As sterile rocks resist the softening rain.
 Tho' to the blind unwonted day returns,
 And pale Disease with health's new ardor burns ;
 Tho' ev'n the grave his mighty will obey'd,
 Unmov'd, untouch'd your listless eyes survey'd.

Driv'n ' thro' the world, unknowing where to lie,
 Despised, rejected, and condemn'd to die,
 Before his foes behold Messiah stand,
 Meek ² as a lamb beneath the shearer's hand.
 O turn on yonder faded form your eyes,
 Oppress'd with sorrow, and consumed in sighs !
 Mark that pale brow, with heavenly blood embrued,
 Where Resignation blends with Fortitude ;
 Those lips in inward prayer that gently move,
 Those eyes, yet beaming with unconquer'd love ;
 That meek composure, that angelic air,
 Those holy looks ; and say if Guilt be there !

O love unbounded, more than words can tell
 Tho' hymning angels on the theme should dwell :

¹ Isai. liii. 3.

² Idem, 7th verse.

Not to one people, not one age confined,
 But flowing ever on to all mankind !
 See, on the cross those limbs in torture hang,
 Convulsed, and quiv'ring with the deathful pang !
 A deeper sorrow dwells upon that face,
 Than Pain's severest agony could trace ;
 Ev'n now his spirit mourns Creation's woes,
 And breathes compassion for his cruel foes.
 See, by a world's united crimes opprest,
 He bows his head submissive on his breast.
 Now fades the light from those expiring eyes,
 And Judah's King—her Lord—her Saviour dies !

Can this be He before whose awful nod
 Ev'n seraphs shrink ? Is this the Son of God ?
 Heir of the world, and Monarch of the sky ?
 The voice of Nature shall itself reply.
 Else why, O Sun, conceal thy face in dread,
 Why tremble, Earth, ¹ and why give up thy dead ?
 Why rends the temple's mystic veil in twain,
 And fearful thunders shake th' affrighted plain ?

Yet, blind to truth, say, wretched outcasts, say,
 Wait ye the Saviour of a future day ?
 Lo, he has lived to bless, has died to save,
 And burst the brazen fetters of the grave !
 Awake, redeem'd Jerusalem, ² awake,
 And from the dust thy sullied garments shake !
 From thy gall'd neck unloose the servile bands,
 And cast the fetters from thy captive hands.
 Break forth, ye mountains, into joyful song !
 Ye barren wilds, the rapt'rous strain prolong !
 Barren no more ; unwonted verdure grows,
 And the dry desert blossoms as the rose.
 Behold, all Nature proves a second birth,
 New skies embrace a new-created earth :
 From the glad scene for ever Woe retires,
 Pain is no more, and Death himself expires.
 Ye angels, strike the full-resounding lyre,
 Swell the glad chorus, all ye heav'nly choir !
 She comes ! ³ she comes ! descending from on high
 The Holy City meets the ravish'd eye !
 Bride of the Lamb, without a spot, or stain,
 Cleans'd of her crimes, and ransom'd of her chain.

¹ Matt. xxvii. 51, 52.

² Isai. lii. 1, 2, 9.

³ Rev. xxi. 1, 2. &c.

Look at her gates, her glorious tow'rs behold,
 More clear than crystal, and more fair than gold.
 There dwell the Lord's Redeem'd, in glory bright,
 Gaze on his face, and live amidst his light :
 Taste the delights, that time can ne'er destroy,
 Eternal fulness of unfading joy.

1817.

CHAUNCY HARE TOWNSEND.

ODE LATINA.

IOL DEBELLATA.

OLIM ut per undas ibat Atlanticas
 Vis provocatæ ad bella Britanniae,
 Ultura despectum tridentem, et
 Jura sui violata ponti,

Dilecta vidit vela, ubi dissitam
 Hispana rupes prospicit Africam,
 De monte Libertas, et Anglis
 Fausta novum cecinit triumphum.

Quo tota Neptuni intremuit domus,
 Urbesque, gentesque, et vaga flumina,
 Latèque consternata tellus
 Horruit; " Ecce dies latroni

Propinquat ultrix, quæ dabit æquori
 Fluctus per orbem volvere liberos,
 Quam mille, diruptis catenis,
 Voce canent choreâque gentes.

At tu, marinâ sede superbiens
 Quæ mœsta latè marmora despicias,
 Captoque detestata nautâ
 Sceptra tenes, quid in arma densos

Cogis maniplos ? quid galeam manu
 Tergis ? quid arcem mœnibus instruis,
 Firmasque turres ? quid minaces
 Ense micant jaculoque dextræ ?

O cæca fatis ! nonne procul vides
 Quæ, foeta Martis fulmine lugubri,
 Effusa tempestas ab Arcto
 Occiduas equitet per undas ?

Jovisne fulvo milvius aliti
Opponit unguēs, aut ovium lupus
Prædator umbrosâ ruentem
Provocat e siluâ leonem?

Non hæc repulsæ classis Iberiæ,
Non Occidentem deseruit vagus
Pirata, cognatoque, prædam
Ipse petens, ninitatur hosti ;

Sed dura pubes, quam neque flamina
Furentis Austri, non Aquilo minax,
Non ipsa deterrebat Arctos,
Indomitæ penetræ brumæ.

Quâ fraude terrarum ac maris arbitros
Devota falles? I, pete navibus
Campos, ubi Australes virescit
Inter aquas nemorumque murmur

Perennis æstas, aut ubi frigoris
Flammæque sentit perpetuas vices
Thule ; vel extremos virorum
Seras adi, rutilosve pronæ

Tractus diei ; non tamen Angliam,
Non arma, justique effugies minas
Belli, neque expertem Britannæ
Invenies ditionis undam."

Dixit, carinâ sed freta fervidus
Rupit minister fulminis Anglici,
Et, classe conjunctâ, Batavus,
Æquorei socius pericli,

Dextrâ probavit, quid furor æmulus,
Et restituti vincula fœderis
Possent, quid, ejecto Tyranno,
Legitimi pia jura regni.

Quantum illa terrorem intulerit dies,
Testes cadentûm fumida mœnium
Fragmenta, victricique classis
Per tenebras populata flammâ,

Fuscæque cladem in sedibus abditis
Flevēre matres, et caput Africæ
Lugubrè ploravit, recisis
Viribus ; una dies trecentis

Exemit annis dedecus et notam;
Afflicta quid non debuit Angliæ
Europa, captivos reducens
In patriam populumque cives?

Quæ non coegit dura Necessitas,
Odere fortes bella, neque impios
Sperant tyrannorum triumphos;
Cælum animo superosque tangit

Extollit udâ qui miseros humo,
Et jure, rectum qui colit, imperat,
Hinc nomen Anglorum, subacto
Hic melior titulus profundo.

Nostro resurgat munere ditior
Terra otiosæ blanda Neapolis,
Prædamque Sardoas ad urbes
Angligenûm referant carinæ,

Cùm nos iniquis non miseras opes
Scrutamur armis, non decus imperi,
Nec vile permutamus aurum
Sanguine degeneres Britanno.

Ergo auspicatam cùm jubar aurei
Solis revectum retulerit diem,
Collesque ridebunt aprici, et
Unda vagis recreata ventis,

Tum feriatas ad mare virgines
Ducent choreas et juvenum manus
Conjuncta, dum surgat per umbram
Hesperus, ille levesque risus

Levesque curas spectat amantium;
Matresque circum et solliciti patres
Stabunt, neque infestum timebunt
Per tenebras dare vela nautam.

Quò Jus, et Æquum, et sancta vocat Fides,
Itur Britannis; alter in arcibus
Stet victor, Alpinamque brumam
Transiliat, famulasque secum

Traducat Artes, mox grave dedecus,
Vicesque diras illacrymabilis
Passurus exul; nos coronat
Dia Themis meliore lauru;

Nos, cùm tyrannorum et titulos ducum,
 Longoque fractas tempore imagines,
 Famamque marcentem tenebris
 Presserit invidiosa Lethe,
 Dicet patronos vox pia posterum;
 Per mille crescet non fragilis vices,
 Per mille durabit procellas
 Angligenum intemerata virtus.

GUL. NANSON LETTSOM,

1817.

Coll. Trin. Alumn.

* * We have been flattered by an observation made by some of our poetical friends, that Alcaic verses have been more correct since the publication of the rules for that species of verse in the *Classical Journal*. The present Poem is indeed a proof of the truth of the observation. We have not observed an instance of inaccuracy in the versification.—ED.

EPIGRAMMATA.

ΑΙ ΔΕΥΤΕΡΑΙ ΦΡΟΝΤΙΔΕΣ ΣΟΦΩΤΕΡΑΙ.

Εἰς ἀνάθημά τι τῷ Ἀπόλλωνι τῷ ἐν Λευκάδι.

Μέλλων ἄλλεσθαι, τρυφεράς πόθῳ Ἡλιοδώρας,
 Πάμφιλος εἰς χαροπὸν Λευκάδιον πέλαγος,
 τῷ Φοῖβῳ τάδε δῶρ' αὐτὸς δ' ἄψορρος ἀπῆλθον,
 οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐν φθιμένοις φύξιμός ἐστιν Ἔρως.

Particulis variis, furtivoque igne Prometheus
 Fingens, divinâ fecerat arte virum:
 Deinde iterum auctori, seipsum superare volenti,
 Perfectum, e manibus fœmina prodit, opus.

G. J. PENNINGTON,

1817.

Coll. Regal, Alumn.

SENARI GRÆCI, PRÆMIO PORSONIANO,
Quotannis Proposito, Dignati, et in Curia Cantabrigiensi
Recitati.

SHAKSPEARE,

HENRY IV. PART 2. Act 3. Sc. 1.

O Sleep, O gentle Sleep,
 Nature's soft nurse, how have I frighted thee,
 That thou no more wilt weigh my eye-lids down,

And steep my senses in forgetfulness?
 Why rather, Sleep, ly'st thou in smoky cribs,
 Upon uneasy pallets stretching thee,
 And hush'd with buzzing night-flies to thy slumber;
 Than in the perfum'd chambers of the great,
 Under the canopies of costly state,
 And lull'd with sounds of sweetest melody?
 O thou dull god, why ly'st thou with the vile,
 In loathsome beds; and leav'st the kingly couch,
 A watch-case, or a common larum bell?
 Wilt thou, upon the high and giddy mast,
 Seal up the ship-boy's eyes, and rock his brains
 In cradle of the rude imperious surge;
 And in the visitation of the winds,
 Who take the ruffian billows by the top,
 Curling their monstrous heads, and hanging them
 With deafning clamours in the slippery clouds,
 That, with the hurly, Death itself awakes?
 Canst thou, O partial Sleep! give thy repose
 To the wet sea-boy in an hour so rude,
 And, in the calmest and most stillest night,
 With all appliances and means to boot,
 Deny it to a king?

IDEM GRÆCE REDDITUM.

Rex Henricus Somnum alloquitur.

ὦ φίλον Ἰππου θέλγητρον, ὃς βροτῶν δέμας
 μαλακῶς ἀτάλλεις, πῶς ποτ' ἐκφροβῶν σ' ἐμῆς
 εὐνῆς ἀπήλας; οὐ γὰρ ἡδέως ἔτι
 βλέφαρα βαρύνεις, οὐδ', ἀναψύχων πόνου,
 τέγγεις φρένας μοι νηδύμῳ λήθῃ κακῶν.
 τί σ', ἐν στέγαισι πολυκάπνοισι κείμενον,
 νυχίᾳ, βοῶντες ὅξυ, κοιμίζουσ' ὅπῃ
 κώνωπες, ἐν δὲ στιβάσιν ἀστρωτοῖς πεσῶν,
 φιλεῖς καθεύδειν μᾶλλον, ἢ 'ν θυώδεσι
 θαλάμοις τυράννων, πολυτελῶν σκηνῶν ὑπο,
 θελγόμενος ὕμνων ὁμμαθ' ἡδίστῳ μέλει;
 φεῦ! σκαιὸν λέγω σε θεόν, ὃς αὐχμωδοῦς ἔχει
 στρωμνῆς πενήτων, τὸν δὲ βασιλικὸν λέχος
 ἔχοντ', αὔπνον ἐκλέλοιπας, ὡς ὅταν
 κῶδων' ἐν ἄστει πάννυχος τηρῇ φύλαξ.

τί δ' ; οὐκ ἐφ' ὑψηλῶ τε καὶ δυσσεβάτα
 ἰστώ, 'πέδησας βλέφαρα παιῶν ναυβάτη,
 ὥς τ' ἐν λίκνῳ, κνώσσουντ' ἐδίνησας,¹ βρέφος,
 αὐτῇ κλύδωνος ἀλμυροῦ τρικυμία ;
 καὶ ταῦθ', ὅτ' ἄνεμος, ἀγρία μιχθεὶς ἀλλί,
 κυρτῶν λαβὼν που κυμάτων πελωρίας
 ἐπῆρε κορυφᾶς, ἐν δ' ὑγραῖσιν αἰθέρος
 νεφέλαισιν ἐστήριξε, φρικῶδες βρέμων,
 ὥστ' αὐτὸν Αἶδην ἐξεγείρεσθαι κτύπῳ ;
 οὐκ οὖν πέφυκας ἄδικος, ὅς σὰ δῶρ', ἴπνε,
 τοιάδ' ἐν ὥρᾳ, διαβρόχῳ ναύτῃ νέμεις,
 ἄνακτι δ', ὅσπερ ξύμμαχον τὴν νύκτ' ἔχει,
 σιγὴν τε, χῶ, τι κῶμ' ἄγειν κατ' ὀμμάτων²
 φιλεῖ μάλιστα, ταῦτά δωρεῖσθαι φθονεῖς ;

G. J. PENNINGTON,
 Coll. Regal. Alumna.

1817.

CAMBRIDGE EXAMINATIONS FOR A UNIVERSITY SCHOLARSHIP.

As a Supplement to an Article in the first part of this Number, we are enabled to give the course of examination for a University Scholarship in the present year. Our readers will doubtless agree with us, that it would be difficult to propose to the young students of any University in the world a series of exercises, better calculated to call forth their powers, display their learning, or discriminate between the different degrees of their merit.

Morning I.—Essay in Latin prose on the following subject :
 ' Quod enim homini naturaliter insitum est, eo decet uti, et, quicquid agas, agere pro viribus.' Cic. de Senectute.

Morning II.—Translation into Greek Iambics from Exodus xiv. and into Greek Anapests from xv. 1—7.

Morning III.—Translation into English prose from Theocritus, Idyll. vii. 50—89 ; and into English prose and Latin lyrics, the ode of Simonides : "Οτε λάρνακι, κ. τ. λ.

¹ ἐδίνησας—

"Ὡς φαιμένα, δίναστε σάκος μέγα τοῦς δ' ἔλαβ' ὕπνος." THEOCR. Idyll. 24.

² Θελογμένων ἄξει κῶμα κατὰ βλεφάρων. PLATO, apud Brunck. Anthol. tom I. p. 171.

Morning IV.—Translation into English prose from Cicero, At vero Androni Sextilio, &c.; from Tacitus, O conditiones miseræ, &c.; from Sallust, Corpus illi laborum tolerans, &c.; and into Latin verse from Job, c. xxviii.

Morning V.—Translation into English prose from Thucydides ii. 76. Οἱ δὲ Πελοποννήσιοι . . . τὸ προέχον τῆς ἐμβολῆς; Demosthenes in Androtonem: Καὶ μὴν κακῆνόν γε . . . ὥς οὐ πεποίηκεν, ἀποδεικνύναι; Aristotle, περὶ Πητορικῆς, ii. 11. Πῶς δ' ἔχοντες . . . ὑπάρχει αὐτοῖς ἡ τύχη.

Morning VI.—Latin Elegiac verses on the following subject: 'Fertilis frugum pecorumque tellus Spiceâ donet Cererem coronâ, Nutriant foetus et aquæ salubres, Et Jovis aura.' Hor. Carm. Sec.

Morning VII.—Translation into Greek and Latin prose from English prose.

Morning VIII.—The following miscellaneous questions.

1. About what period did the Pelasgi settle in Greece? From what countries did they come? Mention, upon the authority of ancient writers, the principal divisions, and the different migrations, of this people.

2. What was the time, and what the circumstances of the Dorian invasion of the Peloponnesus? What were the consequences to the former inhabitants? and what the different dynasties established by the Dorians in that peninsula?

3. In what part of Greece was the Ionic dialect originally used? Mention the subsequent distinctions in this dialect, and the different authors that used it, whose writings are still extant.

4. Of what nature was the government of the Grecian States as represented in the works of Homer? Compare it with that of other nations in an early state of their civilization. Support your assertions with quotations.

5. What appear to have been the limits of the geographical knowledge of Homer? What progress had other sciences made in his time? What reason is there to suppose that the art of Writing was then known?

6. What arguments respecting the antiquity of Homer's poems can be drawn from the versification? Have you grounds to think it probable that the Iliad and Odyssey are the productions of different persons? Are there any parts of either poem which you assign to a later age?

7. To what ages ought the following works properly to be assigned—Homer's Hymns, Hesiod's Poems, Anacreon's Odes, Æsop's Fables?

8. What were the principal authorities of the Athenian government established by Solon? Enumerate the changes and revolu-

tions which took place in this government to the time of Philip of Macedon, with the dates and circumstances of each.

9. What is the statement of different writers respecting the naval and military forces of the Persians in the invasion of Greece by Xerxes? What appears to have been their total loss in this expedition?

10. What were in succession the predominant Empires in Asia, from the first Assyrian Empire to that of the Parthians? Mention the events which occasioned the power to change hands; and the founder of each dynasty.

11. Enumerate the principal events which took place in Greece between the Peloponnesian and the Phocian Wars, with their dates in Olympiads, and the principal actors in each.

12. Who were the principal Orators contemporary with Demosthenes, and what their respective characters?

13. What are the different Greek historians from whom we derive our knowledge of Grecian affairs, from the earliest times to the death of Alexander? What are the limits of the history of each?

14. Translate the following passages :

EUR. *Iphigenia in Aulide*. v. 366.

μυριοί δέ τοι πεπόνθασ' αὐτὸ πρὸς τὰ πράγματα,
ἐκπονοῦσ' ἔχοντες, εἶτα δ' ἐξεχώρησαν κακῶς,
τὰ μὲν ὑπὸ γνώμης πολιτῶν ἀσυνέτου, τὰ δ' ἐνδίκως,
ἀδύνατοι γεγῶτες αὐτοὶ διαφυλάξασθαι πόλιν.
Ἑλλάδος μάλιστ' ἔγωγε τῆς ταλαιπώρου στένω,
ἧ, θέλουσα δρᾶν τι κεδνὸν βαρβάρους, τοὺς οὐδένας,
καταγελῶντας ἐξανήσει διὰ σέ καὶ τὴν σὴν κόρην.
μηδέν' αἶν γένους ἕκατι προστάτην θείμην χθονός,
μηδ' ὀπλων ἄρχοντα· νοῦν χρὴ τὸν στρατηλάτην ἔχειν
πόλεος· ὡς ἄρχων ἀνὴρ πᾶς, ξύνεσιν ἢ ἔχων τύχην.

SOPH. *Philoctetes*. v. 827.

"Ἵπν' ὀδύνας ἀδαῆς, "Ἵπνε δ' ἀλγέων,
εὐαῆς ἡμῖν ἔλθοις,
εὐαίαν, εὐαίαν ἀναξ·
ὄμμασι δ' ἀντίσχοις τάνδ' αἶγλαν,
ἃ τέταται τανῦν.
ἴθι, ἴθι μοι παιῶν.
ὦ τέκνον, ὅρα γε ποῦ στάσει,
ποῖ δὲ βάσει, πῶς δέ μοι
τάντεῦθεν φροντίδος ὄρᾳς
ἦδη, πρὸς τί μενοῦμεν πράσσειν;
καιρός τοι πάντων γνώμαν ἴσχων
πολὺ παρὰ πόδα κράτος ἄρνεται.

15. Explain distinctly the usages of the indicative, subjunctive, and optative moods after ὥς, ὅπως, ἵνα, ὅφρα.

16. Give the laws and restrictions observed in the regular anapestic measures used in Tragedy, and in Comedy, with instances in each case.

17. What is the distinction between the three ages of Greek Comedy? What political characters were introduced upon the stage by Aristophanes? What reason is there to attribute to him any share in the destruction of Socrates?

18. Give instances of the changes made by Horace in each of the Lyric metres which he borrowed from the Greeks.

19. Give some account of the first settlers in Italy, their names, origin, and language; and mention the original sources of the Latin language.

20. Give some particulars of the life of Sallust—the commotions of the State in which he was concerned, and the part he acted, with your opinion of his style as an historian.

21. Give an account of the Roman Calendar.

22. Enumerate the principal events which took place in the Roman State from the end of the third Punic War to the death of Julius Cæsar, with their dates.

ADVERSARIA LITERARIA.

NO. XIII.

I beg to offer to you what I am inclined to think the true exposition of a very brief, though a wonderfully fine, comparison, which occurs in *Iliad*. xiii. 754, 755. The subject of it is Hector: and the hero in his impetuous course is compared by the poet, if we literally translate his words, to a *snowy mountain*.

Ἡ ῥα, καὶ ὠρμήθη, ὅρξει νιφόεντι ἑοικώς,
Κεκλιγώς, διὰ δὲ Τρώων πέτετ', ἥδ' ἐπικούρων.

According to Clarke, *Similitudo hic desumta, partim ex corporis proceritate et robore, partim ex galeæ splendore et albitudine cristæ*. According to Pope, *This simile is very short in the original, and requires to be opened a little to discover its full beauty*. I am not of M. Dacier's opinion, that the lustre of Hector's armour was that which furnished Homer with this image: it seems rather to allude to the plume upon his helmet, in the action of shaking which this hero is so frequently painted by our

author, and thence distinguished by the remarkable epithet κορυθαίολος. This is a very pleasing image, and very much what the painters call picturesque.

Now, with all due respect to these two eminent men, it is still difficult to conceive, how the poet should think it an apt illustration of his subject, to compare a rapidly moving warrior to a deep-rooted and stationary mountain, merely because the man wore a helmet with a white crest, and because the mountain was topped with white snow. The leading idea, present to the mind of Homer, and fully expressed by the word ὤρμῃθη, was certainly, the rapid motion of Hector, not his white crest; and, both the total silence of the poet in this place relative to the white decoration, and the obvious turn of the sentence itself, require us to conclude, that the hero is compared to a snowy mountain on account of his rapid motion. How then are we to elucidate such an extraordinary comparison? Very naturally and easily, I think, by supposing that the poet alludes to an avalanche or gigantic mass of snow, which in mountainous Alpine regions is often detached from the side or summit of a glacier, and which rushes with tremendous and accumulating force down to the valley beneath. If this be the meaning of Homer, perhaps there is not a more magnificent simile in the whole Iliad: and his rambling life and inquisitive humor make it not improbable, that he might have heard from eye-witnesses an account of the ruin produced by an Alpine avalanche.

G. S. F.

Use of Arches known among the Ancients.

Finding that many artists imagine that the use of arches in building was unknown to the ancients, I send you the following most respectable testimonies, in confutation of that opinion.

In the first place, this is evident from a very beautiful passage in the treatise Περὶ Κόσμου, or, On the World, ascribed to Aristotle, and which, if not written by him, is acknowledged by all the learned to be of great antiquity. Proclus, in his Commentaries on the Timæus of Plato, cites it as a work which was believed long before his time to be the production of Aristotle, though it is not indubitably certain that he was the author of it. The passage is this: ἔοικε δὲ ὅντως, εἰ καὶ μικρότερον, παραβάλλειν τὸν κόσμον τοῖς ἑμφάλοις λεγομένοις τοῖς ἐν ταῖς ψαλίσι λίθοις, οἱ μέσοι κείμενοι κατὰ τὴν εἰς ἑκάτερον μέρος ἔνδοσιν, ἐν ἀρμονίᾳ τηροῦσι καὶ ἐν τάξει τὸ πᾶν σχῆμα τῆς ψαλίδος καὶ ἀκίνητον. i. e. "The world indeed appears to resemble (though it is comparing a great thing with one that is small) what are called key-stones in arches of stone, which, being

situated in the middle of the pressure on each side, preserve the whole figure of the arch in harmony and order, and in an immovable position." And afterwards, he admirably observes, "that this is the relation which God has in the world, since he connects the harmony and preservation of the whole of things." Τὐτον οὖν ἔχει τὸν λόγον ὁ θεὸς ἐν κόσμῳ, συνέχων τὴν τῶν ὅλων ἁρμονίαν τε καὶ σωτηρίαν. The other testimony is that of Seneca, who in his 90th Epistle says, that, though the invention of arches is ascribed to Democritus, yet it is necessary that prior to him there should have been bridges and gates, the summits of which are curved. His words are as follow: "Democritus, inquit, invenisse dicitur fornicem, ut lapidum curvatura paulatim inclinatorum medio saxo alligaretur. Hoc dicam falsum esse. Necesse est enim aut Democritum, et pontes et portas fuisse, quarum fere summa curvantur."

T. TAYLOR.

On the death of Jerome Savonarola, (who was burnt alive in 1498, at Florence,) by Giovanni Antonio Flaminio.

Dum fera flamma tuos, Hieronyme, pascitur artus,
 Religio, sacras dilaniata comas,
 Flevit, et, O, dixit, crudeles, parcite, flammæ;
 Parcite, sunt isto viscera nostra rogo.

Menage, having sent a Spanish Dictionary to a friend as a present, received in return a dozen of excellent Beaune wine. He immediately sent the following Epigram:

Lexicon Hispanicum tibi do; tu vascula bis sex
 Belnensi gratus das mihi fœta mero.
 Quod si nosse cupis munus præstantius utrum;
 Quis dubitet? præstat munus, amice, tuum.
 Unam quippe meo discas e munere linguam;
 Omnibus at linguis per tua dona loquar.

In tumultum Laurentii Toscani.

Si Virtus, Pietasque mori, ac Prudentia possent,
 Debuerant, Laurens, te moriente mori.

Ἐκτορα Πριαμίδην, καὶ εἰ μάλα καρτερός ἐστιν.

Hom. *Iliad.* xiii. 316.

This verse is suspected to be spurious, and to have been inserted for explanation. One proof has not been observed: *καὶ* is not used long before a vowel, unless it is digammated, which it is not in *εἰ*. This position has, indeed, offended the ear of some of our best critics, who have recommended a transposition.

Sabellicus had, in his historical works, written many sound maxims of prudence, wisdom, and morality; but his life was far from giving an example of those virtues. Hence Latomus sent him this distych:

Quid juvat humanos scire atque evolvere casus,
Si fugienda facis, si facienda fugis?

Literary Intelligence.

GERMANY.

We present to our readers our usual extract from the Catalogue of books published at the Easter Leipzig fair, 1817. Fuller Catalogues may be had of Black and Son, and also of Bohte, York Street, Covent-Garden.

Acta nova Reg. soc. scient. Upsal. vol. vii. 4to. Upsal, 1817.

Adelung's, J. C., *Mithridates od. allgemeine Sprachenkunde mit dem Vater-Unser, als Sprachprobe in beinahe fünfhundert Sprachen u. Mundarten.* 4r u. letzt. bd. fortgesetzt von Dr. J. S. Vater. 8. Berlin, 1817.

Adelung's, F. von, *Nachtrage zum 1n, 2n, und 3n, bde. des Mithridates, nebst einer Abhandlung d. Hrn. Min. v. Humboldt, über d. Vaskische.* Herausg. v. Dr. J. S. Vater. 8. Ibid. 1817.

Æschylos, die Perser, u. Sieben gegen Theben, in d. Versart d. Urschrift, verdeutscht von C. P. Conz. 8. Tübingen, 1817.

Anakreon's Lieder. Neu übersetzt u. m. nöthigen Erläuterungen begleitet, v. Dr. A. Drexel. 8. Landshut, 1817.

Anthologia Gr. ad. fid. Cod. olim Palatini nunc Parisini ex apographo Gothano edita. Curavit, epigr. in Cod. Palat. desiderata et annot. crit. adjecit Fr. Jacobs. Tom. ivus. et ult. Appa-

rat. Crit. ad Antholog. complect. Acced. var. lect. ex ipso cod. Palat. collata a Dr. A. J. Paulssen. 8. Lipsiæ. 1817.

Apollonii Alexandrini de Constructione lib. iv. Ex recensione J. Bekkeri. 8. Berolini. 1817.

Appendix ad Arnobii Afri edit. Lipsiensem, continens annott. et emendatt. quasdam cum priorum interpp. aliorum Vv. Dd. in hac edit. omissas, inspersis C. A. Heumanni conject. hactenus ineditis, quibus suar. annott. supplement. adj. J. C. Orellius. 8. Lipsiæ. 1817.

Appendix ad totius Latinitatis lexicon Æg. Forcellini fol. Patavii et Lipsiæ. 1817.

Ars Consentii V. C. de barbarismis et metaplasms, nunc primum e vet. cod. in lucem protracta. 8. Berolini. 1817.

Bax, C., de naturæ simplicitate in Euripidis Oreste Disputatio. 8. Trajecti ad Rhenum et Lips. 1817.

Beck, Prof. J. R. G. Lexicon Lat.-Græcum manuale in usum scholarum, accedit index prosodicus. 8. Lipsiæ. 1817.

Bellerman's, J. F., Versuch einer erklärung morgenländischer Talismane, m. 1 Kupfert. 8. Erfurt. 1817.

Bendavid, Laz. zur berechnung und geschichte des jüdischen Kalenders, aus d. Quellen dargestellt. 8. Berlin. 1817.

Bertholdt's, Dr. L., Histor. krit. Einleit. in d. sämmtl. kanon. und apokryph. Schriften d. alten u. neuen Testaments. 6r und letzt. Theil. 8. Erlangen, 1817.

Bibel, od. d. ganze heil. Schrift. des alten u. neuen Testaments, aus d. Grundsprachen übersetz u. durch nöthige Anmerkung. erläutert v. Dr. E. F. C. Cærtel. 1r. band. die 5 bücher Mosis enthaltend. 4. Anspach. 1817.

Blätter, philologische. 1s. heft. 8. Breslau, 1817.

Brandstetter, R., das griechische zeitwort, systematisch dargestellt. 8. Landshut. 1817.

Brafidas, od. gebahrende Antwort auf d. in der Jen. allgem. Litt. Zeit. N. 172. 1816. erschienene recension der von Prof. Berger griechisch mit deutscher metrischen Uebersetzung herausgeg. ächten Fabeln des Babrius. 4. München. 1817.

Buttmann's, Ph., griechische Grammatik. 8. Berlin. 1817.

Buttmann und Schleiermacher über Heindorf und Wolf. 8. Ibid. 1817.

Callimachi hymni et epigrammata in usum lectionum edidit H. F. M. Volger. 8. Lipsiæ. 1817.

Cäsars, J. C., Denkwürdigkeiten aus d. gallischen und bürgerlichen Kriege übersetzt von P. L. Haus 3te Ausgabe, Durchaus umgearb. von D. F. Strack, 2 theile 8. Frankfurt a. Main. 1817.

Chœrili, Samii, quæ supersunt collegit et illustravit, de Chœrili ætate, vita, et poesi alisque Chœrilis disseruit A. F. Naeckius. Inest de Sardanapali epigram matis disputatio. 8. Lips. 1817.

Ciceronis, M. T. Opera quæ supersunt omnia, et diperditorum fragmenta. Recognov. C. G. Schütz. tom. xvi. pars 1ma et 2da. 8. Lips. 1817.

Ciceronis, M. T. de natura Deorum, lib. iii. ex recensione J. A. Ernesti, et cum eruditorum notis quas J. Davisii edit. ultima habet. Accedunt F. Creuzeri annott. ac præfat. et var. lect. ex xiii. cod. Mss. nondum collatis enotatæ. Apparatum crit. et notas aliquot suas adj. G. H. Moser. 8. Lips. 1817.

Ciceronis, M. T., ad M. Brutam orator. Ex recensione J. A. Ernesti. Edit. repetita. 8. Lips. 1817.

Dessen auserlesene Reden übersetzt von J. C. Wolff. 3r. bd. oder Reden gegen den Verres. 1r. bd. 8. Altona, 1817.

Clementis Alexandrini liber, quis dives salutem consequi possit, perpetuo commentario illustratus a C. Segaar. Gr. et Lat. 8. Trajecti ad Rhenum et Lips. 1817.

Creutzeri, F. Meletemata e disciplina antiquitatis. Fasc. 2us. 8. Lips. 1817.

Dereser, Th. A. Grammatica Hebraica, cum notis masoreticis ac dictis quibusdam vet. testamenti classicis. 8. Lucernæ et Lips. 1817.

Dionysii Halicarn. Romanarum antiquitat. pars hactenus desiderata, nunc denique ope codd. Ambrosianorum ab Aug. Maio quantum licuit restituta. Gr. Ad edit. princ. Mediolanensem. 8. Francofurti ad Mœnum. 1817.

Engel's Dr. Ph. C. T., Hebraische Grammatik für die Ersten Anfänger 8. Giessen. 1817.

Euripidis Tragoediæ et Fragmenta. Recensuit, interp. lat. correxit, schol. gr. e codd. Mss. partim supplevit, partim emendavit Aug. Matthia. tom. 4us. complect. scholia gr. 8. Lips. 1817.

Eutropii Hist. Romanæ, ed. accurat. mit Deutschen Anmerkungen u. einem Wortregister, von G. F. Seebodi. 8. Hannover. 1817.

Frähn, C. M., de Arabicorum etiam auctorum libris vulgatis crisi poscentibus emaculati exemplo posito historiæ Saracenicæ Elmacini, 4. Casani et Lips. 1817.

Fundgruben des Orients, bearbeitet durch eine Gesellschaft von Liebhabern. 5r. bd. 1s.—4s. heft. fol. Wien. 1817.

Gesenius, Dr. W., ausführlicheres gram. krit. Lehrgebäude d. hebräischen Sprache mit durchgangiger Vergleichung d. verwandten dialekte. 2 bde. 8. Leipzig. 1817.

Dessen hebräische. Grammatik. Zweite verbess. auflage. 8. Halle. 1817.

Dessen hebräisches Lesebuch. Zweite verbesserte auflage. 8. Ibid. 1817.

Gnomici poetæ Græci. Ad opt. exemplar. fidem emendavit R. F. P. Brunck. Edit. nov. corr. notisque et indd. aucta. 8. Lips. 1817.

Gregorius aus Cypern, d. Patriarchen, Selbst biographie. nebst-einem d. ungedruckten Briefe Gregor's, griechisch aus ein. Handschrift herausg. von Dr. F. C. Matthia. 4. Frankf. a. Main. 1817.

Hamaker, H. A., Lectiones Philostrateæ. Fasc. 1us. 8. Lugd. Bat. 1817.

Hammer's, J. v., Geschichte der schönen Redekunste Persiens, vom vierten Jahrh. d. Hedschira bis auf unsre Zeit. 4. Wein. 1817.

Harlesii, T. C., Supplementa ad breviorē notitiā literaturæ Romanæ; continuavit C. F. H. Klügling. Pars IIIa. 8. Lips. 1817.

Hartmann, A. T., Auf Gerhard Tychoen od. Wanderungen durch die mannigfaltigsten Gebiete d. biblisch asiatischen Literatur. 1s. Bdchen. 8. Bremen. 1817.

Dessen, Linguist. Einleitung in das studium der Bücher des A. Testaments, m. ein. Anwendung auf die jüdisch-palästinische Schreibart d. N. Testamentlichen Schriftsteller. 8. Ibid. 1817.

Heinrichii, C. F., Auctarium emendationum in M. Frontonis reliquias ex nupera editione Berolinensi. 8. Kiliae. 1817.

Hempel, T., de Diis laribus. Lips. 1817.

Ejusd. nonnulla consensionis historiæ sacræ cum profanis exempla. 8. Ibid. 1817.

Hermann, G., über die bestrittene Cäsar im Trimeter der griechischen Komödie. 8. Berlin. 1817.

Hipponactis, et Ananii Iambographorum fragmenta, edidit T. F. Welckerus. 4. Göttingæ. 1817.

Historia præcipuorum Arabum regnorum, ante Islamismum, e codd. Mss. Arabb. bibliothecæ Reg. Havniensis collegit, vertit,

animadversiones addidit Dr. et Prof. J. L. Rasmussen. 4. Havniæ. 1817.

Homeri Ilias ex recensione F. A. Wolfii. ed. nov. 11 voll. 8. Lips. 1817.

Dessen Ilias u. Odyssee, in Umrissen auf 64 Platten vorgestellt von J. Flaxman. 2 hefte. fol. Berlin. 1817.

Horazen's Briefe aus d. lateinischen übersetzt u. mit historischen Einleit. u. andern nöthigen erläuterungen versehen von C. M. Wieland. 3te auflage. 2 thle. 8. Leipz. 1817.

Horatius Flaccus, des Q., Werke in gereimten Uebersetzung. und Nachahmungen von verschied. deutschen Dichtern aus alterer u. neuerer Zeit. Herausgeg. durch J. S. Rosenheyn. 8. Königsberg. 1817.

Hottinger, J. J., opuscula philologica, critica atque hermeneutica. 8. Lips. 1817.

Isocratis Panegyricus. Textum recognovit cum animadversionibus D. S. F. N. Mori, suisque edidit F. A. G. Spohn. 8. Lips. 1817.

Krause, J. F., Animadversiones in secundam epistolam Pauli ad Corinthios. Pars IIIa. 4. Regiomonti. 1817.

Kuinöl, Dr. C. T., Commentarius in libros Nov. Testamenti historicos. vol. IIum. Evangelium Johannis. Ed. secunda. 8. Lips. 1817.

Lucke, Fr. über den neutestamentlichen Kanon des Eusebius von Cäsarea. 8. Berlin. 1817.

Meyer, Dr. G. G., de Chrysostomo literarum sacrarum interprete. Particula IVta. 4. Norimbergæ. 1817.

Michaelis, J. D., Arabische Chrestomathie. 3te von Prof. Bernstein verbesserte u. vermehrte Ausgabe. 8. Göttingen. 1817.

Middeldorpf. Dr. H. Curæ hexaplares in librum Jobi, e cod. Syriaco-hexaplatari Ambrosiano-Mediolanensi. 4. Vratislaviæ. 1817.

Müller, M. Z. Moritz, C. C. Sallustius, od. hist. krit. Untersuchung der Nachrichten von seinem leben, der Urtheile über seine Schriften und der Erklärung derselben. Nebst einem Beitrag zur Kritik des Cicero und Seneca. 8. Züllichau. 1817.

Münter's, Dr. F. Religion der Karthager. 8. Kopenhagen. 1817.

Nounos von Panopolis, der Dichter.—Ein Beitrag zur geschichte der Griech. Poesie, vom wirklichen Staatsr. von Ouwaroff, m. ein. Zueignung an Göthe u. Anmerkungen von Prof. F. Gräfe. 4. Petersburg, u. Leipz. 1817.

Nösselt, Dr. J. A. Opuscula. Fasc. IIIus. 8. Halæ. 1817.

Pfeiffer's, Joh. Berichtigung der gewöhnlichen Lesart des Neuen Testaments, und Darstellung aller sinnverändernden u. sonst merkwürd. Varianten. 8. Berlin. 1817.

Phædri, fabularum Æsopiarum libb. v. et Publii Syri aliorumque vett. sententiæ ex recensione Bentlei, passim Codd. Mss. auctoritate necnon metri et rhythmici musici ope reficta. Additum est glossarium a Conr. G. Anton. Post mortem patris edidit Car. T. Anton. 8. Zittaviæ. 1817.

Pindari Carmina, curavit C. G. Heyne. edit. nov. et ex schedis Heynianis aucta. III tom. 8. Lips. 1817.

Platonis Dialogi, græce et lat. Ex recensione Imm. Bekkeri. Part. IIæ. Vol. IIIum. et Part IIIæ. Vol. Ium. 8. Berolini. 1817.

Dessen Phädro und Gastmahl übersetzt u. m. Anmerkungen begleitet von Fr. Ast. 8. Jena. 1817.

Dessen Werke von Fr. Schleiermacher. In. Thls. Ir. bd. 2te. Auflage. 8. Berlin. 1817.

Poppo, E. F., de usu particulæ *av* apud Græcos dissertatio Ima. 4. Lips. 1817.

Reinhardt, J. F., de L. A. Senecæ vita atque scriptis. 8. Jenæ. 1817.

Rosenmüller, E. F. C., Scholia in Vetus Testamentum. vol. IIIii. pars IIa. Edit. sec. auct. et emend. 8. Lips. 1817.

Sallustius, C. C., Catilina, und des M. T. Cicero vier Reden gegen Catilina. Aufs neue verdeutscht u. erläutert von Dr. G. F. W. Grosse. 8. Halle. 1817.

Sallust's, C. C., übriggebliebene Werke, ausser den Bruchstücken, übersetzt durch J. K. v. Strombeck. 8. Göttingen. 1817.

Sammlung der neuesten Uebersetzungen d. römischen Prosaiker, m. erlaut. Anmerk. 7r. Theil. in 2 bden. Cäsar's Denkwürdigkeiten. 8. Frankf. a. Main. 1817.

Schäfer, G. H. Thesaurus criticus novus. Ed. nov. 8. Lips. 1817.

Schmidt, Dr. F. W. V., tausend griechische Wörter, welche in den Wörterbüchern von F. G. Schneider u. F. W. Riemer fehlen. 4. Berlin. 1817.

Schmidt, W. J., über die Vortheile des Erlernens der griechischen Sprache. 8. Göttingen. 1817.

Schott, Dr. H. A., Opuscula exegetico-dogmatica. 8. Jena. 1817.

Schulz, Dr. D. der Brief an die Hebräer. Einleitung, Uebersetzung, u. Anmerkungen. 8. Breslau. 1817.

Stolberg, Fr. Leopold, Graf zu, Geschichte d. Religion Jesu Christi. 13r. bd. 8. Hamburg. 1817.

Strabonis Geographia. Tom. Ius. Græce, Ed. notis illustravit. Coray. 8. Lips. 1817.

Taciti, C. C., Germania. Recensuit et cum notis G. G. Bredow denuo edidit Dr. F. Passow. 8. Vratislaviæ. 1817.

Dessen Germanien. Uebersetzt m. Erläuterungen von K. Sprengel. 8. Halle. 1817.

Tennemann's, Dr. W. G. Geschichte d. Philosophie. 10r. bd. 8. Leipz. 1817.

Theologumena arithmeticæ ad rarissimum exemplar Parisiense emendatius descripta. Accedunt Nicomachi Gerasini Arithmeticæ. Edid. F. Astius. 8. Lips. 1817.

Theophrasti peripatetici notationes morum, ex interpretatione J. G. Berndtii, Jauro Silesii ad exemplar a J. F. Fischero castigatum et recensitum. 8. Ratenoviæ. 1817.

Thucydidis de bello Peloponnesiaco libb. viii. ad optim. libb. fidem edit. tom. IIus. 12. Lips. 1817.

Tibulli, A. Carmina libb. iii. cum lib. ivto. Sulpiciæ et aliorum. cur. Chr. G. Heynii. Edit. quart. notis et observatt. aux. E. F. C. Wunderlich. 2. voll. Lips. 1817.

Tibullus, A. m. deutscher Uebersetzung u. ein. Auswahl der vorzüglich prüfenden u. erläuternd. Anmerkungen. 4. Nürnberg. 1817.

Wagneri, C. F. C., de temporibus verbi, imprimis latini Commentatio. 4. Marburgi. 1817.

Wette, W. M. L. de, Lehrbuch d. hist. krit. Einleit. in die kanon. u. apokryph. Bücher des Alten Testaments. 8. Berlin. 1817.

Wolf, F. A. literar. Analekten für alte literatur und kunst. 2s. heft. 8. Berlin. 1817.

PREPARING FOR PUBLICATION.

CLASSICAL.

M. GAIL announces the continuation of his Historical, Military, Geographical, and Philological Researches, under the general title of the *Philologue*. The second volume contains many grammatical and lexicological contributions towards the improvement of the New Edition of H. Stephens' *Thesaurus Linguae Græcæ*, now in the press at London. M. Gail intends likewise to establish a new monthly Journal at Paris, to be entitled *le Philo-*

logue, the first number of which, containing 240 8vo. pages, will appear on the 1st of January 1818, if a sufficient number of subscribers can be obtained before that time. As in the second volume of his *Researches*, the disquisitions in the *Journal* noticed above, will relate principally to Grammar and Lexicology, but without neglecting ancient Literature, History, Tactics, and Geography, with reference to Herodotus, Thucydides, Xenophon, and the *Thesaurus Linguae Græcæ*. M. Gail has proved, that he is well qualified for conducting such a *Journal*, by several erudite Articles in the *London Classical Journal*, by his excellent Editions of Xenophon and Thucydides, in Greek, Latin, and French, with elucidatory Maps and Plates; and by his *Atlas* to facilitate the study of Ancient History, which have met with the approbation of all Greek scholars in Europe.

IN THE PRESS.

CLASSICAL.

No III. of Stephens' Greek *Thesaurus* will be published on the 1st of November.

Mr. T. TAYLOR is reprinting his translation of *Aristotle's Ethics, Rhetoric, and Politics*, in 2 Vols. 8vo. for the use of the Universities.

Mr. DIBDIN's *Bibliographical Decameron* will be published on the 1st of November. Price 9l. 9s. The work, executed in the finest style of printing, in three royal octavo volumes, will be found to contain, in the whole, not fewer than four hundred and sixty embellishments: of which upwards of eighty are upon copper; exclusively of the head and tail pieces, and initial capital letters, to each Day.

A concise Grammar of the Romaic, or Modern Greek Language, with Phrases and Dialogues on the most familiar Subjects, compiled by Dr. Robertson, after a residence of some years in the Ionian Islands. 12mo.

Herodian's Pseudo-Lexicon vocatum Epimerismi, collated from the Manuscript in Paris, under the direction of Professor Boissonade, whose critical and explanatory notes will be added. One vol. 8vo.

Leonis Diaconi Historia: de Tactica ad Imperat. Nicephorum Phocam; Fragmentum Historiæ Joannis Epiphani, &c. Gr. et Lat. cum notis, &c. Hasii, Parisiis, et typographia regia, in folio.

This volume completes the collection of the Byzantine Historians.

Æneæ Tactici Liber de toleranda obsidione, Gr. ad Codd. Mss. recens. vers. Latinam et Comment. Casauboni, notasque var. et suas adjecit Jo. Conr. Orellius. Supplementum ad editionem Polybii Schweighæuserianam, Lipsiæ, in 8vo.

Strabonis *Geographica*, a Siebenkees et Tzschucke, tom. vii. et viii. absol. a Friedemann, in 8vo.

BIBLICAL.

An Introduction to the Critical Study and Knowledge of the Holy Scriptures: in three Parts. By Mr. T. H. Horne. In two large volumes 8vo., illustrated with Maps. Part I. will comprise a concise view of the geography of Palestine, and of the political, religious, moral, and civil state of the Jews; illustrating the principal events recorded in the Bible. Part II. will present a copious investigation of the principles of Scripture interpretation, and their application to the historical, prophetic, typical, doctrinal, and moral parts of the Sacred Writings, as well as to the practical reading of the Scriptures. Part III. will be appropriated to the analysis of the Bible; including an account of the canon of Scripture; together with critical prefaces, and synopses to each book upon an improved plan. An Appendix will be subjoined; containing an account, 1. Of the principal Mss. and editions of the Old and New Testaments; 2. Of various readings, with a digest of the chief rules for weighing and applying them; 3. Rules for the better understanding of Hebraisms; 4. A concise Dictionary of the symbolical language of Scripture; 5. Lists of commentators and biblical critics of eminence, with bibliographical and critical notices of each, extracted from authentic sources: together with chronological and other tables, necessary to facilitate the study of the Holy Scriptures.

Extract of a Memoir, relative to the Progress of the Translations of the Sacred Scriptures at Serampore, in the year 1815.

In the course of the past year, the Pentateuch has been printed off in the *Orissa* language. This fully completes that Version of the Scriptures; and thus the whole of the Sacred Oracles are now published in *two* of the languages of India—the *Bengalee* and the *Orissa*.

In the *Sungskrit*, the Historical Books have been completed at press. In this ancient language, therefore, the parent of nearly all the rest, three of the five parts, into which we divide the Scrip-

tures, are both translated and published—the New Testament, the Pentateuch, and the Historical Books. Two remain, the Hagiographa, which is now put to press, and the Prophetic Books, the translation of which is nearly finished.

In the *Hindee* language, the Historical Books are printed off: three fifths of the whole Scriptures are therefore published in this language. The Hagiographa is also put to press, and the Prophetic Books are translated. It was mentioned, in the last Memoir, that the second edition of the New Testament in this language was nearly finished: it is now in circulation.

In the *Mahratta* language, the Historical Books are nearly printed off: the Pentateuch and the New Testament have been long in circulation. After these, ranks the *Shikh*, in which the New Testament is printed off, and the Pentateuch printed nearly to the end of Exodus.

In the *Chinese*, the Pentateuch is put to press; but various circumstances have concurred to retard the printing. The method of printing with moveable types being entirely new in that language, much time is necessarily requisite to bring it to a due degree of perfection. The present type, in which we are printing, is the fourth in size which we have cut, each of which has sustained a gradual reduction. This last, in which we are printing both the Pentateuch and the Epistles, is so far reduced, that, while a beautiful legibility is preserved, the whole of the Old Testament will be comprised in little more than the size of an English Octavo Bible, and the New Testament will be brought into nearly the same number of pages as an English New Testament. The translation of the Old Testament is advanced nearly to the end of the Prophet Ezekiel.

In the *Telinga* language, the New Testament is more than half through the press. In the *Bruj*, also, the New Testament is printed nearly to the end of the Epistle to the Romans.—Three of the Four Gospels are finished in the Pushtoo or Affghan language,ⁿ the Bulochee, and the Assamese. Those in which St. Matthew is either finished, or nearly so, are, the Kurnata, the Kuncuna, the Mooltanee, the Sindhee, the Kashmeer, the Bikaner, the Nepal, the Ooduy pore, the Marawar, the Juy pore, the Khassee, and the Burman languages.

A very important resolution passed at the second meeting of the Committee of the Russian Bible Society, purporting, that they should not consider themselves to have attained the object of their Institution, till they had provided with a Bible, every family, and, if possible, every individual, in the Russian empire. With what

ardour they are pushing forward to the attainment of this object, and accelerating the complete redemption of their pledge, will be seen, when it is stated, that, from the establishment of the Society to the present time, its Committee have either published, or are engaged in publishing, no fewer than *forty-three* editions of the Sacred Scriptures, in *seventeen* different languages, forming a grand total of 196,000 copies. In the course of 1816, the Committee have completed,

	Copies.
Slavonian Bibles	10,000
Slavonian New Testaments	10,000
Finnish Bibles	5,000
French Bibles	5,000
Samogitian New Testaments	5,000

The printing of the following editions is either continued, or has been begun, in 1817 :

	Copies.
Slavonian Bibles	20,000
Slavonian New Testaments	5,000
Armenian Bibles	5,000
Armenian New Testaments	3,000
Greek Bibles	3,000
Greek New Testaments	5,000
Georgian New Testaments	2,000
Moldavian Bibles	5,000
Moldavian New Testaments	5,000
German Catholic Testaments	5,000
Lettonian New Testaments	5,000
Dorpatian Esthonian Testaments	5,000
Tartar New Testaments	2,000
—— Gospel of St. Luke, (extra copies)	2,000
—— Psalms	2,000
Calmuc Gospel	2,000

The number of Bibles and Testaments, issued in the course of the year, amounts to 19,431 copies, which is only about 500 copies fewer than were issued the three former years put together. The expenditures are nearly in the same proportion. During the three years, 1813, 1814, and 1815, the expenditure amounted to 297,642 rubles, 47 copecs; in 1816, alone, 227,770 rubles, 73 copecs.

Besides the above, preparations are making for Stereotype editions of the Scriptures, in five different languages: they are in a course of translation into the *Common Russian*, *Tartar*, and *Carelian* languages; and measures are adopting for procuring translations into *Turkish Armenian* and *Buriat Mongolian*.

When the Report was finished, His Excellency Mr. Turgeneff gave an account of the progress and success of the Bible Societies in other parts of the world, and expatiated particularly on the gigantic operations of the British and Foreign Bible Society.

JUST PUBLISHED.

CLASSICAL.

Bibliotheca Classica Scriptorum Græcorum diligentissime curata. Qui literis græcis delectantur, iis collectionem novam Auctorum Græcorum ita inscribendam et impensis meis edendam indico. Complectetur hæc bibliotheca probatissimos utriusque orationis scriptores Græcos, quorum multi novis curis emendati prodibunt. Godofred. Henric. Schæferus, Professor Lipsiensis, vir laude mea major, curam geret typographicam; forma erit, quam dicunt octavam, eademque minor. Literis exscribetur oculis legentium haud fatigantibus, versuum et capitum numeri indicabuntur, atque tum cultu et habitu, quo ornabitur idoneo, tum facilitate, qua emi et comparari poterit, curabo, ut hæc collectio præstet.

Tomus primus, *Æschylum* exhibens, mercatu vernali hujus anni venum ivit. Scrib. Lips. m. Mart. 1817. J. A. G. WEIGEL.

Ἡ δὲ εἰς τὸ ἔαρ, συνταχθεῖσα ὑπὸ Κωνστ. Νικολοπούλου. Paris. 1817. 8vo. pp. v + 12.

Nonnos von Panoplos der dichter. Ein Beytrag zur Geschichte der Griechischen Poesie. Vom Wirklichen Staatsrath Ouwaroff, St. Petersburg. 1817. 4to. pp. viii + 103.

Dissertation sur une Médaille inédite de *Phroate* IV., et sur quatre Médailles d'Attambilus; par M. Grivaud de la Vincelle. Paris. 4to. 1817.

ΙΣΟΚΡΑΤΟΥΣ ΠΑΝΗΓΥΡΙΚΟΣ. Le Panégyrique ou Eloge d'Athènes, par Isocrate. Texte Grec, revu soigneusement sur les meilleures éditions, accompagné de notes historiques, critiques et grammaticales, etc. par E. P. M. Longueville. 12mo. pp. xxii + 264. Paris. 1817.

Minéralogie Homérique, ou Essai sur les Minéraux, dont il est fait mention dans les poèmes d'Homère. Sec. édit. corrigée et augmentée. 1816. in 8°, 6 fr., et 5 fr. par la poste.

Cet Ouvrage est élégamment imprimé, sur beau papier, et accompagné de deux vignettes.

Litterarische Analekten vorzüglich für alte Litteratur & Kunst deren Geschichte & Methodik. Herausgegeben von Fr. Aug. Wolf. Numb. II. pag. 261—522 + vi.

This Number contains: 1. Commentatio ad Horat. Carm. i. 1.

29. by M. Wolf.—2. Ex familiari interpretatione Ciceronis de Nat. D. i. 1—10. by the same.—3. De Pherecydis fragmentis: by A. Matthiæ.—4. Der Achat der heiligen Kapelle: by A. Hirt.—5. Athens Denkmäler, von Lord Elgin: by the same.—6. Über ein dem Philodemus beigelegtes epigramm: by Fr. Jacobs.—7. Conjecturæ de locis nonnullis Plutarchi: by the same.—8. De voce ἀνδρείκελον: by E. H. Barker.—9. Io. Nic. Niclas: by F. Hulsemann.—10. Mélanges Littéraires: by M. de Villoison.—11. Quæstiones Epistolicae de orthographicis quibusdam Græcis: by M. Wolf.—12. Miscella Critica: by A. Seidler, C. F. Heinrich, et M. Wolf.—13. Mala aut inelegans Latinitas in scriptis recentiorum: by M. Wolf et M. Heinrich. &c. &c. &c.

M. T. *Ciceronis Orationum* pro Scauro, pro Tullio, pro Flacco, partes ineditæ, cum schol. ad orat. pro Scauro item ineditis, recensuit, notis illustravit A. Majus. Cum emendationibus suis et commentariis ediderunt A. G. CRAMERUS, et C. F. HEINRICHUS. 4to. Kiel 1816.

Library of classical authors, Grecian and Roman: or [répertoire] of editions and translations of classical authors, published in Holland at the end of 1816. 8vo. Berlin 1817.

Spicilegium criticum in Thucydidem et Livium: auct. Dr. A. F. LINDAU. 4to. Breslau 1817.

Philological Feuilles, a periodical work; published by a Society of men attached to ancient literature and antiquities. I.—104 pp. in 8vo. Breslau 1817.—[This number gives an analysis of ‘Obs. crit. in Thucyd. Auctore F. POPPO. Leipsic 1815:’ and of ‘Tibullus, published by HUSCHKE, Rostok 1814:’ and of Dutch *distiques imités* de different ancient authors.]

Euripidis Dramata: illustravit E. ZIMMERMANN. Vol. iv. pars prior. 8vo. Frankfort 1816.

The Roman History of *Titus Livius*, with the supplements of Freinshemius, translated into Italian by *le Chevalier* LUIGI MABIL. Vol. xxxiii. 12mo. Brescia 1816.

Introduction to the history of Grecian and Roman literature, by G. D. FUHRMANN. Vol. ii. 8vo. Rudolstadt 1816.

Cornelii Nepotis Vitæ excell. Imperatt. Adjecto Lexico. Editionem curavit M. C. F. LUTTMANN. 8vo. Leipsic 1816.

Specimen inaugurale, exhibens *Miscellanea Literaria*, auctore L. A. F. BUMA. 4to. Leyde 1816. [Its object is a critical analysis of the *Electra* of Sophocles.]

Specimen literarium exhibens obs. in Xenophontis Symposium et Cyropadium, auctore J. BROWN. 8vo. Leyde. 1816.

Xenophontis quæ exstant. Ex libb. scriptt. fide et vv. dd. conjecturis recensuit et interpretatus est J. G. SCHNEIDER. Tom. iv. 8vo. Leipsic 1816. [This vol. contains the Memorabilia and the Apology of Socrates.]

A Translation of the *Aeneid*: with a preface and critical notes: by C. SYMMONS. 4to. London 1817. [Only 250 copies printed.]

Obss. on the ancient comic theatre of Athens, by P. F. KANN-
GIESSER. 8vo. Breslau 1817.

I. BEKKER *Anecdota Græca*. Vol. ii. 8vo, Berlin 1816.

Opuscula Mythologica, philosophica, et grammatica, ex codd. maxime Palatinis nunc primum edidit, eorumque librorum notitiam et annotationem adjecit, F. CREUZER.

Essay on the life and writings of *Plato*, to determine the chronological order of the authentic Dialogues, published as an introduction to the study of the works of Plato, by F. AST. 8vo. Leipsic. 1816.

ANTIQUITIES.

Atheniensiæ, or obss. on the topography and buildings of Athens, by W. WILKINS. Lond. 1816.

Elucidations of some ancient gems, or engraved stones, by A. de NORDSTERN. 8vo. Altenburgh 1817.

Italy.—The Abbate MAI has published at Milan, an advertisement, dated May 1, 1817, relative to a small work of Philo edited by him last year. This Treatise on Virtue, which in the Milan Ms. bears the name of Philo, was written according to other Mss. by George Gemistes Pletho, a Greek author of the 15th century. It has even been long printed with the name of the latter (*græce et latine*, Basileæ, Oporin, 1552, 8vo.—*græce cum Stobæo*, Antuerpiæ, Plantin, 1575, fol. &c.) M. Mai, therefore, declares that he shall erase it from the list of inedited works lately published by him, observing at the same time, that it would not be impossible to assert the claim of Philo to this little Treatise, 1. because the Milan Ms. attributes it to him; 2. because the style seems not unworthy of antiquity; 3. because Gemistes Pletho, who has borrowed from various ancient authors, as Aristotle, Theophrastus, Xenophon, Plutarch, and Arrian, might have done the same in regard to Philo; 4. because Philo actually composed books, no longer extant, upon virtue. Anticipating, however, the answers that might be made to these four observations, and unwilling to engage in any dispute on the subject, M. Mai requests scholars to consider his edition, of which he distributed but a very small number of copies, as cancelled.

BIBLICAL.

A new translation, being the sixth edition, of the Treatise concerning Heaven and its wonders, and also concerning Hell—being a relation of things heard and seen by the Hon. Emanuel Swedenborg. 8vo. Demy, 8s. 6d.—Royal, 12s. 6d.

Sermons on Faith, Doctrines, and Public Duties, by the Very Rev. W. VINCENT, D. D., late Dean of Westminster. 8vo. 1817.

To sixteen Sermons, such as might be expected from the learning, orthodoxy, and piety of the author, is added a *Concio ad Clerum*, in which the purest doctrines of the Gospel are displayed in easy, correct, and elegant Latinity.

As a supplement to the account of Dr. Vincent's Life, given in our late Numbers, we extract from this publication the following Epitaph, written by himself :

Hic requiescit
Quod mortale est
GULIELMI VINCENT,
Qui puer
sub domus hujusce penetralibus
enutritus,
mox,
post studia Academica confecta,
unde abiit reversus,
atque ex imo Præceptorum gradu
summum adeptus,
Decanatu tandem hujusce Ecclesiæ,
quam unice dilexit,
decoratus est.
Qualis fuerit vita, studiis, moribus,
Lapis Sepulchralis taceat.¹
Ortus ex honesta stirpe Vincentiorum
de Shepy, in agro Leicestriensi ;
Natus Londini Novembris secundo 1739 ;
Denatus Decembris 21^{mo}
1815.

ORIENTAL.

Fantasies of antiquity, or a collection of the mythological traditions of the Greeks, Romans, Egyptians, and other oriental nations. By J. A. RICHTER. 5 v. 8vo. Leipsic 1815—1817.

¹ To this modest silence respecting his talents and his virtues, an elegant and proper allusion is made in the Prologue to the Westminster Play of 1816. See *Class. Journ.* No. XXIX. p. 158.

J. B. Gail, Lecteur Royal et Conservateur des Manuscrits Grecs et Latins à M. le Rédacteur du Classical Journal; *Sur la prétendue ville d'Olympie.*

Monsieur le Rédacteur,

M. l'Abbé Ciampi, professeur à Pise, et M. de Hause, à Palerme, en Sicile, ont, tous les deux à différentes époques, nié l'existence de la ville d'Olympie : à qui des deux appartient l'honneur de la découverte ? ni à l'un ni à l'autre. On en trouve la preuve dans le rapport de l'Institut, 2 Juillet 1813, p. 42. On y annonce un mémoire où j'essaie de prouver, ce que cinq ans auparavant j'avais enseigné dans mon école, qu'il n'y a jamais eu de ville d'Olympie, et qu'il ne manque à cette ville tant célébrée, si bien décrite par les géographes, si bien représentée par de savans burins, que d'avoir existé. J'ai lu ce mémoire en 1812, fait attesté par le rapport de l'Institut, 2 Juillet 1813, p. 42. Je n'ai donc rien pris ni à M. de Hause ni à M. l'Abbé Ciampi : l'avantage de la priorité m'appartient donc. J'ai dû en faire la remarque puisqu'elle a échappé à l'impartial M. Quatremère, rendant compte de l'opinion de M. de Hause. Elle n'étoit pas indifférente, puisque mon mémoire, en révélant une erreur à nos géographes, combat en outre une doctrine scholastique erronée, et qu'elle apprend à nos écoles à éviter un contre-sens six cent fois répété par les scholiastes, commentateurs, traducteurs, lesquels, avant moi, traduisoient ἡ Ὀλυμπία, la ville d'Olympie, lorsqu'il falloit traduire, le territoire de l'Olympie, ou l'Olympie. Dans le même article du Journal des Savans, M. Quatremère de Quincy rappelle ce passage de Pausanias (v. p. 401.) *ὑπελθεῖν οὐχ οἷόν τέ ἐστιν ὑπὸ τὸν θρόνον*, que l'on traduit d'après M. Heyne par, *on ne saurait passer derrière le trône* ; ou avec d'autres, *sous le trône*. Mais *ὑπὸ* suivé d'un acc. signifiant *près de*, il faut, je crois, traduire, *il n'est pas possible d'approcher du trône*. Pourquoi ? c'est qu'un mur d'appui et de défense à l'entour du trône empêchoit d'en approcher. (Voy. Paus. l. l. et) Pausan. l. l. et M. Quatremère.

Je reviendrai sur ce passage, et j'examinerai, 1. Si Pausanias *alla sous le trône d'Amyclée*, comme le pense le savant M. Quatremère, quoique le texte me semble dire positivement le contraire. 2°. Si *ὑπὸ τρίποδι* (Paus. iii. p. 294. lig. dern. ; et p. 299. l. 1.) signifie *sous le trépied* ; 3°. Si *ὑπὸ θρόνον* signifie *sous le trône* (Cl. p. 296. l. 27 et 28.) Sur *ὑπὸ* avec dat. et acc. voy. tom. ii. de mes *Recherches Histor. Géogr.* p. 150.

L'Académie Royale des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres a décerné deux prix dans sa séance du 25 Juillet dernier. Le sujet d'un de ces prix, remis l'année dernière au concours, et renvoyé à celle-ci, étoit, de rechercher tout ce qui peut conceruer "l'Histoire

de l'Ecole d'Alexandrie depuis ses commencemens jusqu'aux premières années du troisième siècle de l'ère chrétienne."

"Les auteurs devaient comparer l'état des sciences, des lettres et de la philosophie dans cette école, pendant le période de temps indiqué, avec l'état de ces mêmes connaissances dans la Grèce et dans les diverses parties de l'empire fondé par Alexandre. Ils devaient aussi rechercher les causes des différences qui caractérisent l'Ecole d'Alexandrie, et faire voir comment ces causes ont préparé la doctrine des nouveaux Platoniciens."

L'Académie a décerné le prix au Mémoire enregistré sous le n° 1, et qui a pour épigraphe ce passage de S. Clément d'Alexandrie :

"Φιλοσοφίαν δὲ, οὐ τὴν Στωϊκὴν λέγω, οὐδὲ τὴν Πλατωνικὴν, ἢ τὴν Ἐπικουρείον τε καὶ Ἀριστοτελικὴν· ἀλλ' ὅσα εἴρηται παρ' ἐκάστη τῶν αἱρέσεων τούτων καλῶς (δικαιοσύνην μὲτ' εὐσεβοῦς ἐπιστήμης διδάσκοντα), τοῦτο σύμπαν τὸ ἐκκλησιαστικὸν φιλοσοφίαν φημί."

L'auteur est M. Jacques Matter, homme de lettres, demeurant à Strasbourg, département du Bas-Rhin.

Le sujet de l'autre prix était la question suivante :

"Quels sont, parmi les ouvrages des anciens philosophes grecs, et en particulier parmi les ouvrages d'Aristote, ceux dont la connaissance a été répandue en Occident par les Arabes ?

"A quelle époque, par quelles voies, cette communication a-t-elle eu lieu pour la première fois ?

"Quelle modification a-t-elle apportée à la philosophie scholastique ?"

L'Académie a décerné le prix au Mémoire enregistré sous le n° 1, et qui a pour épigraphe ce passage de Roger Bacon :

"Quatuor sunt maxima comprehendendæ veritatis offendicula, quæ omnem quemcunque sapientem impediunt et vix aliquem permittunt ad verum titulum sapientiæ pervenire, vid. fragilis et indignæ auctoritatis exemplum, consuetudinis diuturnitas, vulgi sensus imperiti, et propriæ ignorantie occultatio cum ostentatione sapientiæ apparentis."

L'auteur est M. Amable Jourdain, Secrétaire-adjoint de l'Ecole royale des langues orientales.

L'Académie Royale des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres renouvelle l'annonce qu'elle fit l'année dernière du sujet du prix qu'elle adjugera dans la séance publique du mois de Juillet 1818. Elle avait proposé de rassembler ce que les monumens de tout genre peuvent fournir concernant les "Annales des Lagides, ou la Chronologie des rois d'Egypte, depuis la mort d'Alexandre-le-Grand jusqu'à l'asservissement de ce pays par les Romains, après la mort de Cléopâtre, fille de Ptolémée-Aulète."

"L'Académie desire qu'on rapporte à leurs dates tous les faits de

cette histoire qui ont une époque certaine; et qu'on détermine, autant qu'il sera possible, la date de l'avènement de chaque prince au trône, et de la fin de chaque règne."

Le prix sera une médaille d'or de la valeur de 1500 fr.

Les ouvrages envoyés au concours devront être écrits en français ou en latin, et ne seront reçus que jusqu'au 1^{er} Avril 1818.

Ce terme est de rigueur.

L'Académie Royale des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres propose pour sujet d'un autre prix qu'elle adjugera dans la séance du mois de Juillet 1819, de "rechercher quelles étaient dans les diverses villes de la Grèce, et particulièrement à Athènes, les différentes fêtes de Bacchus; de fixer le nombre de ces fêtes, et d'indiquer les lieux situés, soit dans la ville, soit hors de la ville où elles étaient célébrées, et les diverses époques de l'année auxquelles elles appartenaient; de distinguer les rites particuliers à chacune de ces fêtes, et de déterminer spécialement ceux qui faisaient partie des cérémonies mystiques."

Le prix sera une médaille d'or de la valeur de 1500 fr.

Les ouvrages envoyés au concours devront être écrits en français ou en latin, et ne seront reçus que jusqu'au 1^{er} Avril 1819.

Ce terme est de rigueur.

Ils devront être adressés francs de port, au secrétariat de l'Institut, avant le terme prescrit, et porter chacun une épigraphe ou devise, qui sera répétée dans un billet cacheté joint au Mémoire, et contenant le nom de l'auteur.

Les concurrens sont prévenus que l'Académie ne rendra aucun des ouvrages qui auront été envoyés au concours; mais les auteurs auront la liberté d'en faire prendre des copies, s'ils en ont besoin.

NOTES TO CORRESPONDENTS.

If any of our Readers should know the residence or address of any of the descendants of *Mailtaire*, we shall feel greatly obliged for information. We wish particularly to ascertain whether he left behind him a collection of Letters from the Duke of Rutland, containing *Critical Observations on Classical Authors*, &c.

We shall give Professor Dunbar's dissertation on the particle *âv* in our next.

We received No. 11. of *Miscellanea Classica* too late for this Number.

The Account of *Classical Mss.* &c. will appear in our next.

M.'s reply to Mr. Bellamy came too late for insertion.

We consider the expression, which is the object of P. M.'s inquiry, as elliptical: in the first clause *homo* is understood with *nemo*, and in the second it is the nom. to *laudet*. A similar form occurs in Cic. de Orat. iii. 14. *Nemo extulit eum verbis, qui ita dixisset,—sed contempsit eum.*

We do not think H. E.'s specimen of English Sapphics calculated to make our readers admire that metre in our language.

The article on Plutarch in our next.

Corrections in the Translation of St. John in our next.

While we acknowledge our obligation to Mr. C., whose favors we shall be glad to receive, we must decline the insertion of the Collation, as we find that the edition of Matthæi is not scarce in this country.

On s'empresera de donner l'article de M. N. sur la *Littérature Grecque* dans le No. prochain. Le retard n'en est nullement volontaire.

Several other articles are received, to which due attention will be paid.

THIS DAY IS PUBLISHED,

In Octavo, with the Plates separate in Folio, 1l. 8s.

TOPOGRAPHY

ILLUSTRATIVE OF THE BATTLE OF PLATÆA

Consisting of Plans of the Plain and City of Plataea, of Plans of Eleuthera, Ænoe, and Phyle, and a View of Eleuthera, from Drawings made on the spot, by T. ALLASON, and engraved by COOKE.

ACCOMPANIED BY MEMOIRS

Read to the Academy of Inscriptions and Belles Lettres of the Institute of France.

BY JOHN SPENCER STANHOPE, F. R. S.

And Acad. Inscip. and Bell. Lett. Instit. Paris. Corresp.

Printed for JOHN MURRAY, Albemarle-Street.

END OF NO. XXXI.

THE
CLASSICAL JOURNAL:

FOR
DECEMBER, 1817.

NO. XXXII.

T

London :

PRINTED BY A. J. VALPY,
TOOKE'S COURT, CHANCERY LANE;

SOLD BY

LONGMAN, HURST, REES, ORME, AND BROWN; RIVING-
TONS; SHERWOOD, NEELY, AND JONES, PATERNOSTER
ROW; BLACK AND SON, YORK-STREET; PARKER,
OXFORD; BARRETT, CAMBRIDGE; MACREDIE
AND CO., EDINBURGH; AND ALL
OTHER BOOKSELLERS.



CONTENTS OF NO. XXXII.

Remarks on the Similarity of Worship that prevailed in different parts of the Pagan World. No. IV. [D. G. WAIT.]	205
Manuscripts, Classical, Biblical, and Biblico-Oriental. No. VIII.....	214
E. H. BARKERI Epistola Critica ad Th. Gaisfordium, de Fragmentis Poetarum Minorum Gr. Pars 6ta.....	217
Prolusio Mercurialis	224
Loci quidam Luciani Emendati atque Explanati. No. VI. A JOANNE SEAGER, A. B.	232
Walckenaer on Ancient Geography.....	257
On the Science of the Egyptians and Chaldeans. Part II. [SIR W. DRUMMOND.]	262
Corrections in the common Translation of the New Testament, No. IV.	274
On the Character of Plutarch, as an Historian: with Remarks on some of the "Lives of the Illustrious Men" of Greece. Part I.	278
VINDICIÆ ANTIQUÆ, No. II.	288
Collatio Codicis Harleiani 5674. cum Odyssea Editionis Ernestinæ 1760. No. VIII.....	309
Notice of Bailey's Hieroglyphicorum Origo et Natura....	313
Some Observations on the Worship of Vesta, and the Holy Fire, in Ancient Rome; with an Account of the Vestal Virgins. By G. H. NOEHDEN, LL. D. Part II.	321

Collection of the Chaldean Oracles, Part I. [T. TAYLOR.]	333
Critique on Ossian's Temora, shewing its great resemblance to the Poems of Homer, Virgil, and Milton. Part II. ..	344
Miscellanea Classica. No. II.....	351
De l'Improvisation Poétique chez les Anciens, et particu- lièrement chez les Grecs et les Romains. Par M. RAOUL- ROCHETTE. 3me. Partie.....	357
Answer to the Observations on Mr. Roberts's Reply to Sir W. Drummond. [P. ROBERTS.].....	372
E. H. BARKER Amœnitates Criticæ et Philologicæ, Pars II.	375
Remarks on the Introductory Chapters of Moses. [JOHN JONES.]	378
Cambridge Tripos, <i>Ægyptus</i>	381
Observations on Horace: Ode 29. Book 3.	383
Roman Inscription at Tarragona.....	387
An important Passage of Photius corrected. [JOHN JONES.]	388
Orchomenian Inscription, from the Original in the British Museum	392
Inscription on the Tomb of Arrian. [SIR WM. OUSELEY.]	394
ADVERSARIA LITERARIA, No. XIV.—Epitaphia Duo— On the Exclusion of Two Scholars of Trinity from the office of saying Grace—Epitaphium—Equus Bellator— Latin Verses—Porson's Charades	395
Literary Intelligence	400
Notes to Correspondents.....	404
Index to Vols. XV. and XVI.	405

THE
CLASSICAL JOURNAL.

NO. XXXII.

DECEMBER, 1817.

REMARKS ON

*The Similarity of Worship that prevailed in different
Parts of the Pagan World.*

: אנשים אחדים — Gen. xiii. 8.

No. IV.—[Continued from No. XXIX. p. 94.]

IF we more particularly draw our attention to that system of Divination, which *so universally* prevailed, we shall discover strong traces of it, even in the writings of Moses. Although divination, in the state in which we find it in idolatrous Egypt, forms no part either of the Jewish history or ritual, yet there undeniably exist parts of Holy Scripture, which are referrible to this current of popular opinion: the whole account of the water of jealousy, in the 5th chapter of Numbers, the different instances of casting lots throughout the sacred volume, and the manner in which the Urim and Thummin are supposed to have revealed the Divine will, besides others, that might be adduced, most satisfactorily demonstrate, that the ceremonies of the Mosaic law were rather rites

purified from vulgar errors, than ordinances absolutely new. The rabbinical Jews, indeed, ever debased in their intellectual researches, were as prone to a superstitious divination, as the nations whom they reprobate: to them certain days and seasons (the eclipse of the moon, and various contingent circumstances,) were inauspicious; they believed the gates of Heaven to be closed every night, and evil spirits to be then endued with miraculous powers; on the contrary, they accounted the cock an auspicious bird, who warned them of the approach of morn, when the infernal authorities were deprived of their sway. Hence, in Reshith Chachemah we read: **ב אי א מה אשר נתן לשכני בינה להבחין בין יום ובין לילה:**

Yet, though they thus bless God,¹ they scruple not to offer the cock in expiation for their own sins, saying at every blow,

זה חליפתי זה תחתיו זה כפרתי זה התרנגול ילך למיתה ואני אלך לחיים טובים עם כל ישראל אמן

and *notwithstanding this*, because he thus bears the sins of a man, the Talmudists dignify him with the name of **גבר**: also, on the new moon in some months, some of them keep a festival for two successive days, others *only for one*, and others yet for a longer time; but, with respect to the majority of their superstitions, all very nearly accord. Although we find no such particular regard to omens, as is discernible among the ancient Romans,² yet divination formed an essential feature in the Druidical creed: with them the haruspices, and sortilegists, were indispensably requisite in the the transaction of every affair of moment, from whence the Druids themselves were sometimes called hadredd, i. e. adders; and pheryllt, teachers of curious arts and sciences, metallurgy, &c. Thus Pliny observes, “*Britannia hodie eam (Magiam) attonitè celebrat tantis cæremoniis, ut eam Persis dedisse videri possit.*” Tacitus also records of the Germans: “*Auspicia, sortesque, ut qui maximè observant sortium consuetudo simplex; virgam frugiferæ arbori decisam, in surculos amputant, eosque notis quibusdam discretos, super candidam vestem tenerè ac fortuitò spargunt:*

¹ A man offers a cock, a woman a hen, a pregnant woman a cock and a hen, &c. &c. See the Muhammedan accounts of the angelic cock in the first Heaven, the representative of all cocks material and immaterial.

² Cicero de Divinatione.

mox, si publicè consulatur, sacerdos civitatis, sin privatim, ipse pater familiæ precatus deos, cœlumque suspiciens, ter singulos tollit, sublato secūdum impressam ante notam interpretatur." Herodotus mentions the divining lots amongst the Scythians, and Ammianus Marcellinus those used by the Alani. Mr. Maurice, and others, have likewise largely written concerning the Anguinum of the Druids, which Pliny thus describes: "Præterea est ovorum genus in magnâ Galliarum famâ omissum Græcis. Angues innumeri æstate convoluti, salivis faucium corporumque squamis glomerantur; Anguinum appellatur. Druidæ sibilis id dicunt in sublimè jactari, sagoque oportere intercipi, ne tellurem attingat. Pro-fugere raptorem equo: serpentes enim insequi, donec arcentur amnis alicujus interventu." Among the Bardic remains are several little poems called GWARDHANAU charms or talismans, or GORCHANAU incantations, which names clearly bear allusion to this fruitful branch of idolatry. Diodorus Siculus says of these people, *μάλιστα δ' ὅταν περὶ τινῶν μεγάλων ἐπισκέπτονται, παρὰ δόξον καὶ ἄπιστον ἔχουσι νόμιμον ἄνθρωπον γὰρ κατασπείσαντες, τύπτουσι μαχαίρᾳ, κατὰ τὸν ὑπὲρ τὸ διάφραγμα τόπον καὶ πεσόντος τοῦ πληγέντος ἐκ τῆς πτωσέως καὶ τοῦ σπαραγμοῦ τῶν μελῶν, ἔτι δὲ τῆς τοῦ αἵματος ῥυσέως τὸ μελλὸν νόουσι, παλαιᾷ τινι καὶ πολυχρονίῳ παρατήσῃ περὶ τούτων πεπιστευκότες.* But, in Strabo's manner of relating it, there appears a trivial difference. Yet, although great was the attachment of the Druids to divination, it is absolutely impossible that they could exceed the nations of the East; for divination is the offspring of superstition, cradled by the wretched priestcraft of oriental climates, being the worthy profession of those oracular impostors, whose sole employment it was to embody the wild horrors of the fancy. Niebuhr relates the juggles and frauds practised by Santons, Derveeshes, and others; and Pietro della Valle gives an entertaining history of the جگر خوار or liver-eaters. Hence is it, that talismans and amulets are eagerly purchased by the fanatic herd, to secure them from the real or imaginary calamities of life, and to invest them with a subaltern species of magic power. Many, however, of these are simply verses from the Koraun, written either in the common character, or in cabbalistical letters; some are tufts made from sea-cows' hair,—water poured from a shell on earth ta-

ken from a dead man's grave,—small beads,—magic knots,—ligatures fastened round the arm,—spherical pieces of wood, &c.—a composition of human bones, or dirty rags, &c.—with many others too numerous to name, which have the peculiar properties of effecting a reconciliation among enemies, of defending from murder, fascination, insanity, and the maladies incident to human life; also from sorcery, more especially from that species called چشم زخم, or fascinating eyes, such as those of the جگر خار—from all kinds of evil, the bites of serpents, &c.; while some of another species are used to cure love, to gain the affections of a lover, to keep husbands and wives faithful,—some, to prevent conception, *ad femora mulierum alligantur*, others to cause it. Many of these are suspended about the necks of camels and horses, for various purposes; and of all طلسم is, perhaps, the most famous, being an amulet bearing on it an infinity of magical or mystical characters under a certain horoscope, which will avail against all calamity and fascination, and preserve every treasure, with which it is buried for purposes of concealment. Of a similar nature is علم الرمل, or the science of sand, which, in addition to other properties, confers prophecy on its possessors. It is a matter of surprise, that these absurdities should have acquired such extent; especially as Mulhammed continually inveighed against the idols and superstitious practices of the Pagan Arabs. In Sura, v. 4. we find this precept, respecting their divining arrows, *وان تستقسموا بالازلام*, of which Sale in his preface has given a minute account, and of which Jellal'oddeen records these particulars:

كانت سبعة عند سادة الكعبة عليها اعلام و كانوا يحيونها فان امرتهم ايتمروا وان تهتهم انتهوا:

which is very similar to the Rabbinical accounts of the Urim and Thummim. This superstition of divining arrows, doubtless, prevailed over all the East; the prophet Ezekiel has poetically mentioned their use at Babylon, in his xxist chap. 21. 22. and Isaiah has continual allusions to the abominations which we have cited. Even Mulhammed, who affected to censure his unconverted coun-

trymen, was not incredulous, as appears from the fable of the Jew Lobbed and his daughter. Originally, these absurdities seem merely to have been prayers and religious duties, metamorphosed by enthusiasts and sectagogues into amulets, charms, and all the monstrous imagery of credulity. Even TEEMOOR, the great and unconquered, wrote a treatise on شَكُون or omens, and in the Persian translation of the Tuzuk, we read, that when one of his mistresses was indisposed,

دوازده سید دعاگوپ جمع آمده یک سال از عمر خود بوی
بکشیدند و بوی صحت یافت و دوازده سال زندگانی کرد

Many of these impostors acquire their livelihood by these practices. The Malays, to this day, yield not in fanaticism to the Arabs, or the ancient Druids; the Chaldæans and Egyptians encouraged occult sciences, as much as possible; and the Hindoos (as may be seen from Mr. Ward's work on their religion and manners) perhaps exceed every nation on earth in superstition:—for instance, the amulet which Koushulya is represented, in the Ramayana, to have bound on Rama's right hand, defended him more efficaciously, than other mantras, from the evil power of the Rakkshashas. The wonderful fables of Odin's magic, the prophetic powers of the Runic characters, and the magic rings of the Samothracians, are all referrible to the same school. The magical book, also, of the Tau-tsë sect, in China, their various sacrifices to spirits, accompanied with extraordinary ceremonies, shew, that at one time, perhaps, there existed not a nation on earth, that was free, altogether, from these and the like fanatical rites.

Diodorus Siculus, speaking of the Hyperborean island, ἐν τοῖς ἀντιπερᾷν τῆς Κελτίκης τόποις κατὰ τὸν Ὠκέανον, in which Apollo was considered to be the chief deity,—in which were many bards, (Κιθαρισταί,) and circular temples, (σφαιροειδῆ τῷ σχήματι,) observes, ἔχειν δὲ τοὺς Ὑπερβορέους ἰδίαν τινα διάλεκτον, καὶ πρὸς τοὺς Ἕλληνας οἰκειότατα διακεῖσθαι and from the ceremonies performed at the vernal equinox, mentioned in the sequel, there can be no difficulty in discovering this Hyperborean island. I conceive, that by ἰδίαν τινα διάλεκτον, Diodorus implies, that our Druids possessed a sacred language; but, whether my interpretation be cor-

rect, let the following observations determine. The affectation of a particular "*holy tongue*," seems to have been very general ; and although, indeed, the common people among the Jews spoke the same language as the high priest and Levites, yet there is no reason for doubting, that they possessed much information, which they withheld from the lower orders. However, from Cæsar, it has been urged, that the Druids were ignorant of the use of letters,¹ and Mr. E. Williams observes, that, before letters were in use among them, they had a wonderful art of assisting the memory, by which art they preserved their traditions. Now, whether the language was preserved orally or by writing, that "wonderful art" may still have been the medium by which the bardic theology has been transmitted to our day ; and the secrecy of the Druids, which originated from the same motive, which induced the ancient Egyptians to conceal their knowledge under symbols and hieroglyphics, may have inclined this order to reject the use of letters, and adopt some other plan of recording their "*memorabilia*." General Vallancey remarks, that the Irish Druids marked cycles on rough stones, as Abraham was said to have done, that there were rude pillars inscribed with Ogham, or sacred characters, which none but Druids could read, (which seems to contradict the authority of Cæsar) ; and Mr. E. Williams supports the General, by averring large stones to have been found in Cardigan bay, with inscriptions in the Roman character, but in some unknown language. Most of those inscriptions which occur in Meyrick's History of Cardiganshire, are either Runic or Latin, in Anglo-Saxon characters. General Vallancey adds, "There is great reason to think that they had three alphabets at one time, the Phœnician, Pelasgian, and Ogham or mysterious ; the last word, Sir Wm. Jones has informed us, is Sanscrit, and used by the Brahmins in that sense." Pausanias, in his tenth book, instances several ancient hymns among the Greeks, "those original Doric hymns, (as Bryant writes,) which were universally sung in their Prutaneia and temples. These were in the *ancient Ammonian* language, and said to have been introduced by Pagasus, Agyieus, and Olen. . This last some represent as a Lycian, others as a Hyperborean, and by many he was deemed an Egyptian. They were

¹ The probability is, that the Druids concealed their use of letters ; Muhammed, for instance, was called the illiterate prophet, although the contrary might easily be substantiated.

chanted by the Purcones, or priests of the Sun, and by the female hierophants, of whom the chief upon record were Phaënnis, Phæmonoë, and Bæo : the last of these mentions Olen as the inventor of verse, and the most ancient priest of Phæbus." On referring carefully to Pausanias, I have been unable to discover Bryant's authority for calling this language "*Ammonian*:" the same indisputably learned, although too fanciful writer, conceives, that many old hymns were preserved in the oracular temples, and long retained and sung, when their meaning was imperfectly known. From the hymns ascribed to Homer, and inserted in the Oxford editions of the *Odyssey*, it is evident that the priests of Delos had hymns in many tongues, and that the priestesses were able to imitate the speech of many people:

Πάντων δ' ἀνθρώπων φωνὰς καὶ Κομβαλιάστῃν
μιμῆσθ' ἴσασι· φαίης δέ κεν αὐτὸς, ἕκαστον
φθέγγεσθ', οὕτω σφι καλὴ συνάρηρεν ἀοιδή.

Onomacritus is also said to have copied some sacred hymns in Pieria, which Bryant calls translations from ancient Orphic poetry, written in the original "*Ammonian*" language; and he thus particularises his meaning: "The Helladians.....were of the race which I term '*Ammonian*,' and came from Egypt and Syria, but originally from Babylonia. They came under various titles, all taken from the religion which they professed." From whence, it would not be difficult to show, that his "*Ammonian* language" must have been a language cognate with the ancient Sanskrita. Peloutier, speaking of the Celts, observes, that their prayers were hymns, "On a vu encore, que ces hymnes se chantaient au son des instrumens, and avec divers mouvemens du corps, de manière que chaque cantique avait non seulement son air, mais même sa danse particulière." Brotier remarks, "Omnibus retro sæculis, et apud barbaras omnes gentes, ut ex Americæ populis nobis adhuc compertum, idem fuit carminum usus," &c. Tacitus, also, says of the Germans: "Sunt illis hæc quoque carmina, quorum relatu, quem BARDITUM vocant, accendunt animos, futuræque pugnae fortunam ipso cantu augurantur; terrent enim, trepidantve, prout sonuit acies. Nec tam voces illæ, quàm virtutis concentus videntur: adfectantur præcipuè asperitas soni, et fractum murmur, objectis ad os scutis, quo plenior et gravior vox repercussa intumescat."

Mr. Davies, the author of the *Celtic Mythology*, is of opinion,

that the Britons, also, anciently had certain mystic poems, composed in some dialect of Asia: accordingly, we find a foreign prayer in the Myvyrian Archæology :

Gwawd Lludd y Mawr.

Kathl goreu gogant,

Wyth nifer nodant ;

.

.

O Brithi, Brithoi,

Nuoës nuedi ;

Brithi, Brithanai, (al. leg. Brithanhai)

Sychedi, edi euroi ! &c. &c.

the translation of which may be found in the Celtic Mythology ; of which this is the final part ;—" On the day of the Sun, there truly assemble five ships, and five hundred of those that make supplication, O Brithi, Brithoi, &c.—O son of the compacted wood ! the shock overtakes me ; we all attend upon Adonai, in the area of Pumpai." These four lines belong to *no* Celtic or Gothic dialect ; and Mr. Faber has concluded them to be Hebrew, according to the following specimen :

הוּ בְרִיתִי בְרִית הָיָא
נוח : עץ נוח עדי
בְרִיתִי בְרִית אֲנִי
סוד עדי עדי הוּא רעי :

Sir Wm. Drummond, in *Class. Journ.* No. xxvi. p. 421, gives a far more ingenious version :

הוּ בְרִיתִי בְרִית עֵי
נוח : עץ נוח עדי
בְרִיתִי בְרִית אֲנִי
סך עדי עדי הוּ רעי :

Monboddo well remarks, that in judging of the affinity of languages, we are but little to regard the vowels, and lay *all our stress* upon the consonants: perhaps, indeed, there may be other tongues to the which these lines are referrible ; but, from the similarity of religious rites, and from the strong authorities which I have elsewhere cited, I am inclined to suppose that these words rather belong to the Sanskrita, than to the Hebrew tongue ; nor need it be a matter of surprize that they have been pronounced Hebrew or

Phœnician, when it is recollected, that an immense number of Chaldee roots are to be found in the Sanskrit lists of Dhatoos. Prithū-Raja is a direct Sanskrit translation of Hu Gadarn; and in the Magadhi, and several colloquial dialects, B is pronounced P, and, as may be seen in Stephanus, *Πρεττανίκη* was used by old writers for *Βρεττανίκη*:—now, on a reference to Captain Wilford's luminous essays, we find that Prithū-Raja was a well-known name in Indian story, and by collating the coinciding points, the correspondence, or rather identity of character, is undeniable:—indeed, Prithū was a form of Vishnū, produced by churning Vena's right arm after his death; who, likewise, afterwards married a form of Lakshmi, and, to finish the whole, Captain Wilford identifies him with Noah. This prayer, it may naturally be imagined, must have some connexion with "the open procession," mentioned at the beginning of the verses, and the ceremony seems to accord with those of Osiris, Isis, and Horus, of Bhawanee and Jagannatha, and the like. Adonai forms no singularity in this piece, since we may discover a variety of Hebrew words in the Bardic remains; and the demi-Christian bards affected to display all that they had learned from the Christians; and as it is well known how great was the enmity that prevailed between them and the Church of Rome, Taliesin boasts, that his lore, as well as theirs, was detailed in Hebraic, which will satisfactorily account for Hebrew terms occurring in Celtic writings. Conceiving, then, these verses to be Sanskrit, I thus translate them, in connexion with the preceding: "On the day of the Sun, there truly assemble five ships, and five hundred of those who make supplication; Io! Mighty One! (Hu Gadarn!) come, thou Mighty One! In our ships be thou conducted! Mighty One! Mighty One! do thou guide (steer) us; be thou our friend, and be our pilot!" which ² seems in perfect unison with the ceremony of the procession of Osiris gubernator mundi, with which that of Hu Gadarn corresponded. Thus does it appear, that the *ἱδια διάλεκτος* of Diodorus Siculus signified a sacred language used by the Druids.

St. John's Coll. Cambridge.

D. G. WAIT.

¹ Gadarn is *mighty*.

² See No. XXI. of the *Classical Journal*, p. 4.

MANUSCRIPTS,
BIBLICAL, CLASSICAL, AND BIBLICO-
ORIENTAL.—No VIII.

** * We have made arrangements for collecting an account of ALL Manuscripts on the foregoing departments of Literature, which at present exist in the various PUBLIC LIBRARIES in GREAT BRITAIN. We shall continue them till finished, when an INDEX will be given of the whole. We shall then collect an account of the Manuscripts in the ROYAL and IMPERIAL LIBRARIES on the Continent.*

THE late Marquis of Lansdowne's Collection of MSS. formed, it is well known, one of the best private collections in the kingdom. They had been procured by the assiduity of two eminent collectors, Mr. James West, and Mr. Ph. Carteret Webb, and relate principally to the laws, government, topography, and civil history of England and Ireland. Mr. West's comprehends 115 vols. in fol. of the Cecil state papers, with some others which have been little known, and are very curious. They also contain Bishop Kennet's historical papers; together with surveys of counties, heraldical collections, with many original and valuable registers of abbeys, &c. Mr. Webb's collections contain papers relating to the history of Parliament, and the revenue of the Chancery, Exchequer, Treasury, Spiritual and Admiralty courts, Wards and Livery, Star-chamber, &c. They also comprehend 30 volumes of the papers of Sir Julius Caesar, Judge of the Admiralty in Queen Elizabeth's reign, and Master of the Rolls in James I. and Charles I.; and from these, it is said, may be obtained an almost entire history of the finances of those reigns.

Besides these two collections, the Lansdowne MSS. contain many valuable articles that were copied from the records in the Tower, and from those which had belonged to that well-known collector of our old English histories and records, Sir Robert Cotton. From among these we have selected the few articles which seemed most to relate to our department of Classical and Oriental literature, in connexion with our xxviii Number of the Classical Journal.

878. Cicero de Inventione Rhetorica, libri ii. This treatise of Cicero's, so remarkable for method and perspicuity, is here written in a hand of as remarkable elegance and correctness. It is a

small octavo, written in the fifteenth century, on vellum, with initials painted and illuminated.

279. Cicero de Officiis, libri iii. This MS. is of the same period, but more abbreviated, and not so well executed in point of correctness. Its system of pointing too is somewhat different. It is a small quarto, written on vellum.

880. Writers on husbandry, Columella, Xenophon, Cato de Re Rustica. In folio, written on vellum: of the fifteenth century. Xenophon is not in Greek; and the treatise, indeed, is rather something in Latin, formed on the Economics of Xenophon. Dissertation or Dialogue of Xenophon.

881. Codex vetus Virgilii Maronis, made from a MS. in the Vatican, so as to preserve the ancient shape of the letters, and accompanied with curious paintings, exhibiting the subjects of the verses as here extracted from different parts of Virgil. It is in quarto, and has this title, "P. Virgilii Maronis Opera quæ supersunt ab Antiquo Codice Vaticano ad priscam Literarum et Imaginum Formam descripta in Bibliotheca Eminentissimi Camilli Maximi Cardinalis." An. MDCLXXVII. The original MS. was very ancient.

882. A MS. of the entire works of Virgil, comprehending the Æneid, the Georgics, and Bucolics, in folio, of the fifteenth century.

883. Horatii Epistolæ, Sermones et Carmina, unà cum Juvenalis et Persii Satyris, on vellum, of the 15th century. This is a fine MS. in quarto, and has something rather curious attached to its history: it formerly belonged to Mathias Corvinus, king of Hungary. It contains some curious and rather strange readings:

Nunquam dimoveas ut nave Caprea—
Quod si me Liricis inseres vocibus.
Feriam sidera sublimi vertice.

This MS. also came into the possession of the celebrated Dr. Taylor, who left it, with many more, to Dr. Askew.

884. Martialis Epigrammata, written in a neat Italic character, on vellum, of about the fifteenth century.

885. Suetonii Opera: an elegantly written MS. on vellum, painted and illuminated, of about the same period.

888. A. M. Boëtii Severini Opera omnia: fol. 2 vols. on vellum, richly illuminated, and very neatly written, of about the fifteenth or sixteenth century. It is supposed these two beautiful volumes, as well as some of the preceding, formerly belonged to the Medicean family at Florence.

1292. Les vrais Clavicules du Roi Salomon, par Armodel, 4to. It also contains le Livre d'Or, which relates to the virtues and characters of the Psalms of David, in French, but with Latin mottoes. The Psalms and Athanasian Creed are here converted into

charms; for it is a book of magic. There is nothing of science in it; and it shows of what trumpery the ancient magic consisted.

1293. *Les véritables Clavicules du Roi Salomon*; another MS. in the style and character of the preceding, though the penmanship is better executed: and he who can take in and digest the *Discours Préliminaire*, being *Solomon's Dedication to his son Roboam*, may easily take in the rest. We are informed, at the beginning of this manuscript, that it was translated from Hebrew into Latin by the Rabbin Aboghazar.

1115. *Chronicon Mundi ab Adamo ad Jesum Christum*: an ancient, and very curious roll, illuminated, well written, and well preserved, but, in some parts, of no greater authority than the preceding book, on magic. Whence is derived the knowledge of the following, which is delivered as an undisputed fact, we know not: *Beata Virgo Maria Mater Domini XII annorum erat, quando conceptus fuit Dominus per Spiritum, together with other minutenesses concerning the day of Christ's birth, &c.*

1301. *Continuata Series et Hist. Omnium Germanorum Imperatorum, necnon Tyrannorum qui Imperium Romanum occupare conati sunt, per Octavium de Strada Martuanum*: a somewhat more modern MS. than the former, and not of such exquisite penmanship, but very useful for those who attend to medals.

1294. *Cabalistarum Dogmata*: a very modern MS. consisting of extracts from that singular and extraordinary man, John Pic de Mirandula, Latin and French, with a copious Index.

The Lansdowne collection did contain several curious Chinese MSS. together with original drawings of fruits and flowers, with views of the interior of China, its costume, manners, customs, and trades; all done by the first artists of the country: it does not appear, however, that they were lodged in the British Museum; nor, indeed, would they have much concerned our department of Classical and Biblico-Oriental MSS.

On reading the above article, the reader will perceive (by consulting the 27th Number of the *Classical Journal*;) that it has not appeared in its due order; and it may be proper to account for the delay, so that it may be understood, that it has proceeded from no neglect, either in the writer or publisher. When the gentleman, who undertook to give an account of the Classical and Biblico-Oriental MSS. in the British Museum, found it necessary, through other engagements, to relinquish this undertaking, the present writer was engaged to complete the work, by giving an account of the Cottonian and Lansdowne MSS. which related to this subject: and this part, so far as the order of time is concerned, was duly performed. His copy was sent, with one or two books, to the publisher, to be inserted in the regular succession: but whether

through want of faithfulness in the person by whom the parcel was sent, or by the parcel being mislaid at the printing-office, it was never received by the publisher. So while the writer, being at a distance, thought the publisher had his reasons for delaying to insert his account, the publisher was ascribing delay to the writer: but from the above true statement, it will appear that neither was in fault.

The writer, having thus, amidst illness and some hurry, imperfectly re-executed what he engaged to perform, doubts not that this article will henceforth proceed regularly.

G. D.

E. H. BARKERI

EPISTOLA CRITICA AD TH. GAISFORDIUM, DE FRAGMENTIS POETARUM MINORUM GR.

PARS SEXTA

THEOGNIS (et ORPHEUS.) Euseb. Præp. Evang. xiii. 1^a, ponit ista, inter alia, ἐκ τῶν Ἀριστοβούλου βασιλεῖ Πτολεμαίῳ προσπεφωνημένων :

Οὐ γὰρ κέν τις ἴδοι θνητῶν μερόπων κραίνοντα,

Εἰ μὴ μουννογενῆς τις ἀπορῥῶξ φύλου ἄνωθεν

Χαλδαίων ἴδρις γὰρ ἔην ἄστροιο πορείης.

* * * * *

Ἀρχὴν αὐτὸς ἔχων καὶ μέσσητον ἡδὲ τελευτήν,

Ὡς λόγος ἀρχαίων, ὡς ὕλογενῆς διέταξεν,

Ἐκ θεόθεν γινώμαισι λαβὼν κατὰ δίπλακα θεσμόν.

Sic edidit Hermannus post Gesnerum. De lectione, quam habet Jos. Scaliger¹ Vett. Gr. Fragm. sel. p. 8., * ὕδογενῆς, pro ὕλογενῆς, uterque silet. “ Multi Orphaica scripserunt, i. e. multorum poemata extabant olim, quorum materia e doctrina Orphei, de quibus vide apud Suid. Sed major pars poematum Orphaicorum

* Voces asterisco notatæ in H. Steph. Thes. non leguntur.

¹ ὈΡΦΑΙΚΟΣ. Titulum hunc articulo suo præfigit vir magnus: Ἐκ τῶν Ὀρφαϊκῶν Ὀνομακρίτου. Aliquid humani passi sunt Editores *Novi Thes. Steph.* Pt. iii. p. 264. n., qui “ dubitant, an a v. Ὀρρεὺς formari possit adject. Ὀρφαϊκός,” quod reperit in Jo. Diacon. Alleg. in Hesiodi Theog. p. 267. a med., Σύγγραμματα δὲ τοῦτο Ὀρφαϊκόν, e Suida afferentes, * Ὀρρεῖα λύρα τοῦ Ὀρρεῖως. Vocem enim hanc satis probam esse, patet e Lat. scriptt. Macrobi. in Somn. Scip. i. 12. :—“ Ipsum autem Liberum Patrem Orphaici τοῦν ἑλικόν suspicantur intelligi, qui ab illo individuo natus in singulos ipse dividitur: ideo in illorum sacris traditur Titanio furore in membra discerptus, et frustis sepultis rursus unus et integer emersisse; quia τοῦς, quem diximus mentem vocari, ex individuo præbendo se dividendum, et rursus ex diviso ad individuum revertendo et mundi implet officia, et naturæ suæ arcana non deserit.”

scripta est ab Onomacrito, de quo ita Tatian. (p. 138. ed. Worth.):
 Ὁρφεὺς δὲ κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν χρόνον Ἡρακλεῖ γέγονεν, ἄλλως τε καὶ τὰ εἰς
 αὐτὸν ἐπισπερόμενα (ἔπη φερόμενα) φασὶν ὑπὸ Ὀνομακρίτου τοῦ Ἀθηναίου
 συντετάχθαι, γενομένου κατὰ τὴν τῶν Πειτιστρατιδῶν ἀρχὴν, περὶ τὴν
 πεντηκοστὴν Ὀλυμπιάδα. Est ergo idem, ad quem scribit Theog-
 nis (v. 503.),

Οἶνοβαρῶ κεφαλὴν, Ὀνομάκριτε, καί με βιάται
 Οἶνος.

Nam temporibus Xerxis illa gnomica scribebat, aut certe circiter
 adventum Medorum et Mardonii sub Dario Hystaspis, ut ipse
 ostendit, cum ait (v. 762.),

Μηδὲν τὸν Μῆδων δειδιότες πόλεμον.

De Onomacrito vide Herod. vi. Extat præstantissimum fragmen-
 tum Orphei de vero Deo Hebræorum, ex quo hos pauculos versu-
 culos excerpimus, qui ad antiquitatem historiæ sacræ pertinent.
 Totum fragmentum qui legere volet, et cum voluptate, et cum
 fructu id fecerit." Scaliger l. c. p. 47. De hoc insigni loco si-
 lent Theognidis editores, Brunckius, Gaisfordius, Bekker, et Schae-
 fer. In præfatione Fr. Sylburgii, nuper a Gaisfordio et Bekkero re-
 petita, non definitum est, quod mirum, quibus temporibus gnomica
 sua scriberet poeta. "Ὑδογενής, ita olim correximus in Fragmentis
 Orphei, quæ vir eruditissimus, amicus noster, H. Stephanus edidit
 A. 1573. Et ita emendate rursum excusum undecim annis post
 in edit. Theognidis et versuum Pythagoræ. Antea inepte lege-
 batur ὕλογενής. Est igitur ὕδογενής, *Aquigena*, h. e. Moses ex aquis
 tanquam natalibus extractus. Nam verbum ΠΨΔ est *Extrahere*,
 ἀνασπᾶται, ΠΨΔ ἀνασπαστός: non autem quod Μῶς *Aquam* Ægyp-
 tiis sonaret, ut nugatur Philo Judæus Ἑλληνιστής, et Hebraismi
 penitus imperitus. Josephus vero amplius largitur. Compositum
 enim ex Μῶ, *Aqua*, et ὕσης, *Extractus ex aqua*, unde coaluerit
 nomen solidum Μωϋσῆς. Alii dicunt Μωϋ Syriace esse *aquam*.
 Denique hinc fluxit dici Μωϋσῆν, potius quam Μωσῆν, quod rectum
 erat. Ezekiel Tragicus:

"Ὀνομα δὲ Μωσῆν ἀνόμαζε, τοῦ χάριν
 Ὑγρᾶς ἀνείλε ποταμίας ἀπ' ἡϊόνος.

Videtur simpliciter a verbo derivare, ut ratio postulat, non ab
 aquis. [Vide Jablonskii Glossar. Vocc. Æg. in *Novæ Thes.*
Steph. Pt. ii. p. ccxli. a, et Sturz. de Dial. Maced. et Alex. *ibid.*
 Pt. i. p. clxxiv. a.] Recte igitur olim ὕδογενής pro ὕλογενής. Sed
 mirum, unde horum notitia Orpheo, aut Onomacrito. Vetustissi-
 mum autem mendum hoc esse non dubito, ut ὕλογενής pro ὕδο-
 γενής legeretur." Scaliger, l. c.

SIMONIDIS Fragm. cxxxviii. "Schol. Homer. Il. N. 103.:
 Ἥϊα, βρώματα, οὐ τὰ ἐν οἴκῳ δὲ ἐσθιόμενα, ἀλλὰ τὰ ἐν ὄρῳ.
 Δεῦτε φίλοι, ἥϊα φερόμεθα,

Σιμωνίδης φησί. Schol. Ven. φερόμεσθα. Sed Schol. hallucinari videtur. Verba Homeri sunt Od. B. 410." Gaisford. Mira est hic negligentia, tanto editore indigna: nam in Schol. Ven. B. quidem legitur φερόμεσθα, sed in Schol. Ven. A. est φερώμεθα.

SIMONIDIS Fragin. clxxviii. "Argum. Eurip. Med. Φερεχύδης δὲ καὶ Σιμωνίδης φασιν, ὡς ἡ Μήδεια ἀφεψήσασα τὸν Ἰάσονα, νέον ποιήσῃ. Vide Schol. Aristoph. Eq. 1318." Gaisford. Pro ἀφεψήσασα, quod vel Gaisfordii, vel typographi incuriæ debetur, lege *ἀνεψήσασα, (quo verbo caret *Schneideri Lex.*) ut legitur in Beckii edit. Mirum est Porsonum ἐψήσασα dedisse, cum paulo post sequantur hæc, Αἰσχύλος δ' ἐν ταῖς Διονύσου Τρόφοις ἱστορεῖ, ὅτι καὶ τὰς Διονύσου τροφούς μετὰ τῶν ἀνδρῶν αὐτῶν ἀνεψήσασα, *ἐνεποίησε. Notandum est verb. νεοποιέω, quod habet quidem *Schneideri Lex.*, sed ἀμαρτύρως. In eodem Argumento occurrit adverb. *γενναίως ab adj. *γενναίῳ. Utrumque vocabulum ignorat Schneider. Locum hunc citat Jacobs. Anthol. T. vii. p. 221. ubi legitur ἀνεψήσασα—ἐποίησε, male pro vulgato ἀνεψ.—ποιήσῃ.

SIMONIDIS Fr. clxvii. "Menander Rhetor p. 31. ed. Heeren. Πεπλασμένοι δὲ, ὅταν αὐτοὶ σωματοποιῶμεν καὶ θεὸν καὶ γονὰς θεῶν ἢ δαιμόνων, ὥσπερ Σιμωνίδης (τὴν) αὔριον δαίμονα κέκληκε, καὶ ἕτεροι Ὀκνον, καὶ ἕτεροι ἕτερόν τινα." Gaisford. Effugerunt ergo hujus viri docti diligentiam verba Ruhkenii hæc in Epist. Crit. i. p. 90.—"Hesiod. 'E. κ. 'H. 803.

Ἐν πέμπτῃ γάρ φασιν Ἐρινύας ἀμφιπολεῦειν,

"Ὀρκον τινυμένας, τὸν Ἔρις τέκε πῆμ' ἐπιόρκους.

Hunc locum respexit Menander Rhetor p. 595. Πεπλασμένοι δὲ "Ἵμνοι ἔταν αὐτοὶ σωματοποιῶμεν καὶ θεὸν, καὶ γονὰς θεῶν ἢ δαιμόνων, ὥσπερ Σιμωνίδης Αὔριον δαίμονα κέκληκε, καὶ ἕτεροι Ὀκνον. Leg. "Ὀρκον. Vide Græv. ad h. l. Eodem modo in Oraculo ap. Herod. vi. 3. "Ὀρκου πάϊς, Horci filia, dicitur Justitia ultrix, ubi v. Wessel." Gaisfordianus Simonidis Index voce Αὔριον caret.

SIMONIDIS Fr. xviii.

Ὡς ὁπότεν χειμέριον κατὰ μῆνα

Τιτύσκη Ζεὺς ἡματα τεσσαρακαίδεκα,

Λαθάνεμόν τε μιν ὦραν

Καλέουσιν ἐπιχθόνιοι, ἱερὰν

Παιδοτρώφον ποικίλας ἀλκυόνος.

"Pro πινύσκη Ruhnck. Ep. Crit. i. p. 38. corrigit τιτύσκη, ut ap. Aratum Phæn. 418.

Πολλάκι γὰρ καὶ τοῦτο νότῳ ἐπὶ σῆμα τιτύσκει

Νύξ αὐτῇ."

Jacobs. a Gaisfordio allatus. "Equidem τιτύσκη substitui vulgato πινύσκη, quod interpretari non licet commode. Postea Ambr. λάνθαν. τὴν μιν ὦραν habet." Schneider. ad Aristot. H. A. v. 8., nescius, ut videtur, ante se, probante Jacobsio, Ruhkenium sic emendasse. Antimachus ap. Schol. ad Nicandri Ther. 471.

Ἡφαίστου πυρὶ εἵκελον, ἦν ῥα τιτύσκει

Δαίμων ἀκροτάτης ὄρεος κορυφῇσι Μοσύχλου,

de quibus versibus vide Editores *Novi Thes. Steph.* Pt. iii. p. 222. n.

2. Ruhnkenii verba sunt hæc :—"H. in Merc. 162.

Μῆτερ ἐμὴ, τί με ταῦτα τιτύσκειαι, ἥτε τέκνον

Νήπιον.

Emenda πινύσκεις. Π. Ξ. 249.

"Ἡδὴ γάρ με καὶ ἄλλο τεῖ ἐπίνυσσεν ἐφετμή.

Naumachius in Stobæo Grotii p. 317.

Μούνη δ' ἀφραδέοντα πινυσσέμεν, ἀλλὰ κατ' αἶσαν.

Callim. H. in Dian. 152.

Κερδαλέω μύθῳ σε, θεῇ, μάλα τῷδε πινύσκει,

ubi v. Spanh. Suidas, ad Homeri locum allatum respiciens, Ἐπίνυσεν ἀντὶ τοῦ διήσειρεν, ubi recte Portum emendare διήγειρεν, intelligitur ex Etym. 122, 33. Πινυτός· ὁ διεγνηγερόμενος τὸν νοῦν. Hesych.

Ἐπινύσκειν διδάσκειν. Scr. Ἐπίνυσκεν. ἐδίδασκεν, ut sit varians lectio loci Homericæ. Contraria labes insedit Simonidis Fragmento ap. Aristot. H. A. v. 9. quod in ordinem redigere conatus est Kuster. ad Suid. T. i. p. 118. J. C. Scaliger πινύσκη vertit *temperat*, Kuster *præparat*, quem sane miror, cum mentem poetæ pulcre viderit, non vidisse maculam. Leg. haud dubie τιτύσκη.

Aratus Phæn. 418. l. c. Nunc conjecturæ meæ v. 162. multum præfero certissimam conjecturam J. Piersoni ad Mœr. p. 119; δεδίσκειαι." Quicquid contradicant critici summi, Ruhnck., Jacobs., Schneider. et Gaisford., recte se habet vulgata lectio in Simonidis Fr. πινύσκη, quod verbum egregie explicuit H. Steph. Thes. Gr. L. iii. 418. f. ab illis prætermisus :—"Πινύσσω et πινύσκω, Mo-

neo, Sapere vel resipere facio, Ad sanam mentem reduco. Suid. πινύσκω exp. πινυτὸν ποιῶ. Quod vero ap. Aristot. l. c. de Alcyone ex Simonide affertur, Ὅποταν χειμέριον κατὰ μῆνα πινύσκη Ζεὺς ἡμά-

τα τεσσαρακαίδεκα, Gaza sic vertit, 'Quum per mensem hybernū Jupiter bis septem molitur dies temporis.' Sed et hic πινύσκειν accipi queat pro σωφρονίζειν, ut Jupiter hybernos dies dicatur πινύσκειν, quum eos veluti castigat, et ex asperis ac frigidis flatus spirantibus leniores serenioresque ac tepidiores reddit : quod per alcyonios dies accidere solet, silente etiam ac pacato mari eo tempore."

Gaisfordius post Jacobs. λαθάνεμον pro vulgato λανθάνεμον dedit, sed vellem vir doctus lectoribus suis exposuisset quid valeat voc. λαθάνεμον. "Λανθάνεμον ὥραν Simonides vocat Tempus, quo silent venti. Gaza vertit Clementiam temporis." H. Steph. Thes. Ind.

Ut verum fateamur, et λαθάνεμον et λανθάνεμον analogiæ repugnare videtur. Sed de his quæstionibus Hermanni nostri sententia expectanda est. Si poeta ληξιάνεμον, α λῆξις, Cessatio, et ἄνεμος, Ventus, scripsisset, nulla dubitatio nobis inhæsisset.

"Democrit. Fragm. Bibl. Gr. vol. iv. p. 335. Θάλασσα μὲν

οὖν * ἀπογαληνιάται τῆς ἀλκυόνος ὡς ἐπαζούσης ἐπὶ ἡμέρας ζ.' Vide ibi Rendtorf. p. 349. et Gemini Elem. Astron. p. 68. ed. Petav. ubi ἀλκυονίδες." Albert. Auctar. Emendd. in Hesych. 238. 21. Eustath. ad Il. I. p. 776. 32. "Ἐτι ἰστέον ὡς Πausanias ἐν τῷ κατ' αὐτὸν Λεξικῷ λέγει, ὅτι ἀλκυονίδες ἡμέραι, αἱ ἐν χειμῶνι γήνημοι καὶ γαλήνην ἔχουσαι καὶ ὅτι περὶ τοῦ αὐτῶν ἀριθμοῦ διαφέρεται. Σιμωνίδης μὲν γὰρ πέντε φησὶν αὐτάς, καὶ Ἀριστοτέλης. Δημαγόρας δὲ ὁ Σάμιος, ἑπτὰ, Φιλόχορος δὲ, ἑνέα, ὅτι δὲ καὶ δεκατέσσαρές εἰσιν, ἕτεροι λέγουσιν. Ὁ δ' αὐτὸς Πausanias μῦθον ἐπ' αὐταῖς καὶ τοῦτον φησιν. Ἀλκυονέως τοῦ γίγαντος θυγατέρες, Φθονία, Ἀθη, Μεθώνη, Ἀλκίππα, Παλλήνη, Δριμῶ, Ἀστερίη. Grammat. S. Germ. in Bekkeri Anecd. Gr. T. i. p. 377. omnino conferendus est: Ἀλκυονίδες ἡμέραι περὶ τοῦ ἀριθμοῦ διαφέρονται. Σιμωνίδης γὰρ ἐν Πεντάθλοις ἑνδεκά φησιν αὐτάς, καὶ Ἀριστοτέλης ἐν τοῖς Περὶ Ζῴων, (v. Kuster. ad Suid.). Δημαγόρας δὲ ὁ Σάμιος ἑπτὰ, Φιλόχορος ἑνέα. Τὸν δὲ ἐπ' αὐταῖς μῦθον Ἀγῆσανδρος ἐν τοῖς Περὶ Ὑπομνήματι (lege e Suida, Ἡγῆσανδρος ἐν τοῖς Περὶ Ὑπομνημάτων) λέγει οὕτως. Ἀλκυονέως τοῦ γίγαντος θυγατέρες ἦσαν Φθονία, Χθονία (dele), Ἀθη, Μεθώνη, Ἀλκίππα, Παλλήνη (Suid. Παλλήνη, leg. ex Eustath. Παλλήνη,) Δριμῶ, Ἀστερίη. In Kusteri Suida pro Φθονία est Φωσθονία, vox nihili. Kusterus:—"Φωσθονία, hanc lectionem MSS. tuentur et edit. Mediol. Reliquæ vero edd. habent Φθονία, Pausan. ap. Eustath. l. c. Φθονίς." Fallitur vir doctus; Eustath. enim in utraque edit. et Bas. et Rom. habet, non Φθονίς, (quæ vox est æque corrupta ac Φωσθονία), sed Φθονία. Vide partem hujusce Epistolæ tertiam in Class. Journ. No. xxvi. p. 388. Pseudo-Didymus ad Il. I. 562., Ζεὺς δὲ θεασάμενος αὐτὴν κλαίουσαν, κατελήσας, ἐπέταξε τοῖς ἀνέμοις, καὶ ὃν ἂν καιρὸν ἡ ἀλκυὼν τίκτει, μὴ πνεῖν, μέχρι τεσσαρεσκαίδεκα ἡμερῶν τοῦ χειμῶνος αὐξανομένου.

SIMONIDIS Fr. lxxii. "Ut multi horum versuum, quos hactenus ex Hephæstione attulimus, non sunt asynarteti, ita ne hi quidem, quos his addimus, in hunc numerum referendi sunt. Et primum quidem, quem Gaisford. ex Epigr. Simonidis in Brunck. Anal. i. 141. commemoravit, ex iambico monometro hypercatalecto, et ordine lagacedico, quem ille alii asynarteto, qui ab Archilochō inventus est, subjecit,

Πολλάκι δὴ φυλῆς Ἀκαμαντίδος ἐν χοροῖσιν ὦρεαι
Ἀνωλόλυξαν κισσοφόροις ἐπὶ διθυράμβοις.

Corruptus est ultimus versus, qui in Cod. Vat. p. 613, sic scriptus est,

Θῆκαν ἰσσεφάνων θεῶν ἕκατι Μοισᾶν.

Bentleius in Epigr. Callim. li. (huic enim hoc Epigr. tribuebatur,) θεῶν αὐτε ἰσσεφάνων collocavit, simili numerorum sono deceptus. Nisi fallor, Μοισᾶν aut plane delendum, aut in initium versus rejiciendum, quod interiiit,

— θῆκαν ἰοστεφάνων θεῶν ἑκατι.

Cæsura diligenter servata est, etsi neglectio ejus non magnam offensionem habitura erat." Hermann. de Metr. p. 605.

SIMONIDIS Fr. xii. Δεύτερον δὲ, φυὰν καλὸν γενέσθαι.

Hermannus noster de Metr. p. 694, habet,

Δεύτερον δὲ, καλὸν φυὰν γενέσθαι.

SIMONIDIS Fr. cxxix.

Φοῖβος ἐσαγεῖται Τυνδαρίδῃσιν αἰοιδῆς,

Ἄν ἄμετροι τέττιγες ἐπεστέψαντο * χορωνῶ.

"Casaub. censet in poeta olim fuisse

αἰοιδὴν

Φοῖβος ἐσαγεῖται Τυνδαρίδῃσιν καλὴν

Τὰν δ'."

Gaisford. "virum doctum præterit Jacobsii emendatio, Additt. Animadvv. in Athen. p. 356:—" Fragmentum ex Epigr. Simonidis pessime depravatum,

Φοῖβος ἐσαγεῖται Τυνδαρίδῃσιν αἰοιδῆσαν

Ἄμετροι τέττιγες ἐπεστέψαντο χορωνῶ,

cujus sensum Casaub. sagaciter enucleavit, sic fortasse restitui debet,

Φοῖβος ἐσαγεῖται Τυνδαρίδῃσιν ἄδην.

Ἄλλ' ἄμετροι τέττιγες ἐπεστέψαντο χορωνῶ,

'Phœbus Tyndaridas artem suam satis et abunde docuit; at cicadæ artis expertes et indoctæ sibi ipsis victoriæ coronam adjudicarunt.' Sic minima mutatione et sensum et metrum restitutum vides."

SIMONIDIS Fr. ccxiv. "Etym. 413. 23. Γράφεται δὲ (ζῶον) μετὰ τοῦ ι, ἐπειδὴ εὐρηται κατὰ διάστασιν καὶ παρὰ Σιμωνίδῃ·

Οἶον τοδ' ἡμῖν ἐρπετὸν παρέπτато

Ζώιον κάκιστον."

Gaisford. confusum est male a viro docto τὸ Etymologi οἶον cum poetæ verbis.

SIMONIDIS Fr. cxiii. "Schol. Soph. Aj. 740., Καὶ ἐν Σιμωνίδῃ ἐπὶ τοῦ πρὸς Αἰγέα ἀγγέλου πεμφθέντος·

Βιότω καὶ σε μᾶλλον ὄνασα πρότερος ἐλθών."

Gaisford. "Simonidis verba, quæ antiquior Schol. (l. c.) comparavit, non sunt emendata a Gaisfordio in Poett. Min. vol. i. p. 392. Ea sic ordinanda,

Βιότου κέ σε μᾶλλον ὄνασα πρότερος ἐλθών."

Hermann. ad Sophoclis Aj. v. 727.

SIMONIDIS Fr. ccxxvii. "Eustath. Il. A. p. 52—39. "Οτι οὐχ ὁμοίως τῷ ποιητῇ σεμνοὶ εἰσιν ἐν τοῖς μύθοις οἱ μετ' αὐτὸν ποιηταί. Πού γάρ σεμνὸν Ὀμήρου ἑκατηβελέτην εἰπόντος τὸν Ἀπόλλωνα, μυθεύεσθαι τὸν Σιμωνίδην ὡς ἑκατὸν βέλεσιν ἀνείλεν ὁ Ἀπόλλων τὸν ἐν Πυθοὶ δράκοντα."

Gaisford. "Quem fugit insignis hic Juliani locus in Epist. xxiv.

p. 395. d. : Σιμωνίδῃ δὲ ἄρα τῷ μελικῷ πρὸς τὴν Ἀπόλλωνος εὐφημίαν ἀρκεῖ τὸν θεὸν * Ἐκατὸν προσιπόντι, καὶ καθάπερ ἀντ' ἄλλου τινὸς ἱεροῦ γνωρίσματος αὐτοῦ τὴν ἐπωνυμίαν κοσμήσαι, διότι τὸν Πύθωνα τὸν δρεκόντα βέλεσιν ἑκατὸν, ὥς φησιν, ἐχειρώσατο· καὶ μᾶλλον αὐτὸν Ἐκατὸν, ἢ Πύθιον χαίρειν προσαγορευόμενον, οἷον κλήρου τινὸς ἐπωνυμίας συμβόλῳ προσφαινόμενον.” Editores *Novi Thes. Steph.* Pt. iii. p. 249. c.

SIMONIDIS Fr. cxxxix. “Plato Protagor. p. 339. a. λέγει γάρ που Σιμωνίδης πρὸς Σκόπαν τὸν Κρέοντος υἱὸν τοῦ Θετταλοῦ, ὅτι,

“Ἄνδρα ἀγαθὸν μὲν ἀλαθέως γενέσθαι χαλεπὸν, χερσὶ τε καὶ ποσὶ καὶ νόῳ τετράγωνον ἄνευ ψόγου τετυγμένον.”

Gaisford. Idem in Appendice ad vol. i. citat hanc Heindorfii notam:—“Carminis reliquias hasce ut numeris suis, quantum fieri posset, restitueret, rogatus a me vir in hoc genere princeps, G. Hermannus, hunc in modum singulos versus digessit :

στρ. α'.

“Ἄνδρ' ἀγαθὸν μὲν ἀλαθέως γενέσθαι χαλεπὸν
Χερσὶν τε καὶ ποσὶ καὶ νόῳ
Τετράγωνον ἄνευ ψόγου τε-
Τυγμένον.”

Juliani Cæsares, p. 333, b., a Gaisfordio prætermissi, Δοκεῖ γὰρ εἶναι μοί πως ἀνὴρ, κατὰ τὸν Σιμωνίδην, τετράγωνος ἄνευ ψόγου τετυγμένος. Ceterum obiter monendum est Simonidem ap. Plat. l. c., ex Hermanni emendatione, voc. * ὀνησίπολις, qua augeri potest *Schneideri Lex.*, usurpasse :

“Ἐμοιγ' ἐξαρχεῖ
Ὅς ἂν μὴ κακὸς ᾦ,
Μηδ' ἄγαν ἀπάλαμνος, εἰ-
Δῶς τ' ὀνησίπολιν δίκαν ὕγιῃς ἀνήρ.

ARCHILOCHI Fr. xlv.

Ἐν δορὶ μὲν μοι μάζα μεμαγμένη, ἐν δορὶ δ' οἶνος

* Ἰσμαρικὸς· πίνω δ' ἐν δορὶ κεκλιμένος.

“Vide Suid. v. Ἰσμαρικὸς, Eustath. Od. I. p. 1633, 48=361, 33.” Gaisford. “Verba, Ἰσμαρικὸς, πίνω δ' ἐν δορὶ κεκλιμένος, pentametrum efficiunt longe perfectissimum. Ne δορὶ cum Editore scribas, vetat Synes. Epist. cxxix. p. 265. c. Suid. T. ii. p. 151. T. iii. p. 551.” Jacobs. Additt. Animadv. in Athen. p. 30.

ARCHILOCHI Fr. xlvi.

ἔα Πάρον,

Καὶ σῦκα κεῖνα, καὶ θαλάσσιον βίον.

“Archilochi senarium, qui spondeum alit in secunda sede, scr. sine hæsitatione,

ἔα Πάρον

Καὶ σῦκα κεῖνα καὶ θαλάσσιον βίον.”

Jacobs. l. c. p. 56. Vide Liebel. p. 82., qui versum sic constituit.

THEOGNIS v. 5.

Φοῖβε ἄναξ, ὅτε μὲν σε θεὰ τέκε πότνια Λητώ,

Φοῖνικος ῥαδινῆς χερσὶν ἐφασμένη,

Ἀθανάτων κάλλιστον ἐπὶ τροχοειδέϊ λίμνῃ, κ. τ. λ.

De hoc loco tacet Gaisford. Quid autem de eo dixerit doctissimus Seidler. ad E. Iphig. Taur. 1074., a Bekkero citatus, nescio. Meursii emendatio et Brunck. et Gaisford. et Bekker. et Schæfer. præteriit. “Λίμνην τ’ Ἀορνόν] Averni graveolentia, et etymon nota ex Lucretio, Strabone, Aristotele, et Plinio. Dicit autem * ἀμφοτεροῦς βρόχῳ, propter formæ rotunditatem. Aristot. Περὶ Θαυμ.: Περὶ τὴν Κύμην, τὴν περὶ Ἰταλίαν, λίμνη ἐστὶν ἡ προσαγορευομένη Ἀορνὸς, αὕτη μὲν, ὡς ἔοικεν, οὐκ ἔχουσά τι θαυμαστόν· περικεῖσθαι γὰρ λέγουσι περὶ αὐτὴν λόφους κύκλῳ, τὸ ὕψος οὐκ ἔλαττον τριῶν σταδίων, καὶ αὐτὴν τῷ σχήματι κυκλοτερεῇ. Eodem modo Theognis,

Ἀθανάτων κάλλιστον ἐπὶ * βροχοειδέϊ λίμνῃ.

Nam ita malim legere, quam, ut vulgo, τροχοειδέϊ.” Meurs. ad Lycophr. 704.

HESIODI Ἐργ. 331. Τῷ δὲ τοι Ζεὺς αὐτὸς ἀγαίεται.

Etym. 5. 15. Ἀγαίεται· Τῷ δ’ ἦτοι Ζεὺς αὐτὸς ἀγαίεται—βασκαίνει, ὀργίζεται, χολοῦται. De hoc Etymologi loco, notantibus Novæ Thes. Steph. Editoribus Pt. iii. p. 189. n. 1., silent et Gaisford., et Hermann. ad Hom. Hymn. in Ven. p. 105., qui e Cod. Viteberg. recte δ’ ἦτοι reposuit, quemque sequi debebat Gaisford.

Thetfordia, Nov. 1817.

E. H. BARKER.

PROLUSIO MERCURIALIS.

Ad amicum præstantiss. item digniss. Præs. Rev. adm.

G. B. Episc. CLUNIENSEM.

HABES, Amice ornatissime, dilectissime, quod te severioribus perfunctum officiis paulisper forsitan oblectet. Te itidem novo huic, quale quale sit, argumento judicem primopere idoneum, qui vel sententiam confirmes, vel errorem redarguas, adhibere aveo. Neve me autem, quamvis latine scribendam judicaverim, rem politius limare posse existumes; scis enim et tute ipse, ut opinor, quam multa per complures jam annos impedièrint quominus literis latinis operam darem.

Cogitanti nuper de notissimi Dei Mercurii indicibus, dotibus, sensu demum mythico, magna mihi incidit suspicio, omnes omnino interpretes miro quodam consensu in hac re hallucinari. Qualem enim nobis ostentant! Quam multiplicem! Quam disparem sibi!

Ede quid illum

Esse putes? Quemvis hominem secum attulit ad nos;

Grammaticus, Rhetor, Geometres, Pictor, Aliptes,

A ugar, Schœnobates, Medicus, Magus.

Juv. Sat. 3. v. 74.

Certe Deos Deasque, mythologici quasi dramatis personas, sibimet ipsis penitus congruentes reddere, opus foret cui minime accingor. Unicuique autem præcipuum quoddam esse videtur signum, aut *χαρακτήρ*, quo plerumque oriantur, aut quorsum spectent de iis omnia figmenta. Fas sit jam mihi, in re mythologica rudi licet atque inexperto, ut hancce notam vel indicem Mercurialem investigare aggrediar; neve supra modum audacem aut arrogantem putes, si intactum aliquid, nec usque adhuc excogitatum, depromam.

Illos præcipue, et toto prorsus cælo errasse mihi quidem videtur, qui, cum Macrobio aliisque, Mercurium *solem* esse interpretantur. Quot igitur soles? Habemus jampridem Harpocratem, Hyperiona, Adonida, Jovem Ammonem, Liberum Patrem, Osiridem, Isidem vel Orum, aliosque plurimos pro sole nonnunquam usurpatos; liceat igitur furto, ei ipsi proprio, utamur, dum hunc saltem turbæ surripiamus. "At sidus ejus scilicet soli conterminum." Bene—quæ autem *contigua* dixeris, totidem verbis *idem* esse negas: vix item stella hæc ob propinquitatem lucida, imo potius obscura, et nimio quasi splendore adumbrata videatur.⁴ Attamen,

Τί Πλειάδεσσι κάμοι;

Τί δ' ἄστρασιν Βώτῳ;

Anacr. Od. 17.

Quid hic nobis cum astronomica, aliisque, quum de mythologica, aut poetica tantum agitur?

Mihi quidem placet sententia quanto quanto huic contraria; nec dubitem sane, vel τῶν κριτικῶν βία, per Mercurium, non *lucem* sed *caliginem* aut tenebras intelligere. Sol igitur et Mercurius inter se dissimillimi—fratres nimirum sunt proculdubio, nempe Jovis filii, quoniam a Prima Causa tam lux quam tenebræ obortæ—fratres autem diversarum adeo naturarum, ut, Dioscorum more, in eodem loco consistere nequeant.

Primus mihi et præcipuus, inter partes defendendas, testis et mystagogus adeat Horatius, cujus Odes 10. L. 1. ne iota quidem omittere velim—En igitur in medias res me projicio.

Quin et Atridas, duce te, superbos

Illo dives Priamus relicto,

Thessalosque ignes et iniqua Trojæ

Castra fefellit.

Quid autem? Solisne, cedo, an caliginis ductu, ita latuit ut ignes hosce vigiles, omniumque oculos, et notitiam falleret? Integros jam accedamus fontes; ibique Iridem a Jove missam ita Priamum compellantem audire est.

Λύσσασθαί σ' ἐκέλευσεν Ὀλύμπιος Ἐκτορα δῖον

Μηδέ τί τοι θάνατος μελέτω φρεσὶ, μηδέ τι τάρβος,

Τοῖος γάρ τοι πόμπος ἄμ' ἔψεται Ἀργειφόντης,

"Ὅς σ' ἄξει εἴως κεν ἁγῶν Ἀχιλῆϊ πελάσση.

⁴ Sidus Mercuriale ob motûs celeritatem nomen sibi vindicat. De quo Minutius Felix (c. 21. P. 108.) "Mercurius alatus, Saturnus, ob cursûs tarditatem, impeditis pedibus adhibetur."

Talem, inquit, ducem,—qualem obsecro? Nonne ita intelligenda est Iris, “Ego minime tibi comes idonea; aderit autem Mercurius, qui te umbris suis protegat et tutetur?” Brevi itaque Jupiter sic imperat Mercurio:

Βάσκη' ἴθι, καὶ Πρίαμον κοίλας ἐπὶ νῆας Ἀχαιῶν
 Ὡς ἄγαγ' ὥς μήτ' ἄρ τις ἴδῃ, μήτ' ἄρ τε νοήσῃ.

Interea Senex, ingruente crepusculo, ad Ili tumultum sistit noctem operiens; mox illum appropinquans Mercurius clam omnibus producit, simulque custodibus, haud secus ac τῷ Ἀργῷ, oculos obsignans, somnum ingerit. Nec multo post, redit̃s ut meminerit monens, et iisdem auspiciis ante solis ortum reducere, sub ipsa aurora evanescit Mercurius;

Ἑρμείας μὲν ἔπειτ' ἀπέβη πρὸς μακρὰν Ὀλυμπον,
 Ὡς δὲ κροκόπεπλος ἐκίδνατο πᾶσαν ἐπ' αἶαν.

—Quæ omnia minime *Soli*, apprime autem *Noctis Deo* consentanea. Poetæ jam ulterius auscultemus.

Tu pias lactis animas reponis
 Sedibus, virgaque levem coerces
 Auræa turbam.

Virga sua scilicet præpotenti animas in Orcum deducit; nec profecto magis idoneus excogitari potest ὁ νεκρόπομπος, quando animæ δηλονότι, quum ipsæ umbræ sint, non per Solis radios iis minime tolerabiles, sed obscure quodammodo, et per tenebras sub Tartara mittantur. Nec non animas interdum ex Orco reducit—ut Virgilius,

Tum virgam capit; hac animas ille evocat Orco
 Pallentes:

quippe quas, si unquam rediissent, occulte redire necesse est. Qui igitur Deorum superiorum nuncius est, idem inferorum regno incolas suppeditat.

—Nigrique Jovis vacua atria ditat

Mortibus.—

Stat. 2. 49.

Unde merito sane dicatur

Superis Deorum
 Gratus, et imis.

De hoc similiter Claudianus,

—————Commune profundis

Et superis numen, qui fas per limen utrumque
 Solus habet, geminoque facit commercia mundo.¹

Utrumque scilicet regnum penetrat, cum utrumque nobis pariter obscurum sit, atque ἄδηλον.

Jam rtio sese offert παμμηχανὸς iste,
 Callidum quidquid placuit jocosò
 Condere furto.

Luxne igitur an tenebræ? dies an nox furto accommodatio? Dignus quidem noster qui furum Deus adhibeatur, ut nempe eorum latro-

¹ Idem asserit de Nocte ipsâ Spencerus noster:

For she in hell and heaven had power equally.

F. 2. B. 1. C. 5. St. 31.

omnia et prædationes velamine suo protegat. Caligo omnium quasi fur est metaphoricus, aut jocosus, qui omnia per breve spatium e conspectu amovet, at simul ac “redeunt spectacula mane;” redeunt illico τὰ ἀπολωλότα.—Sic enim deinceps Poeta noster:

Te boves olim nisi reddidisses
Per dolum amotas, puerum minaci
Voce dum terret, viduus pharetra
Risit Apollo.

Boves Admeti Thessaliæ regis ab Apolline custoditas, surripuit Mercurius; hoc est, quæ interdiu securæ erant, noctu vel abstraherantur, vel errabant. Porro hæc fecisse dicitur dum admodum puer, quia nox, simul ac inducta est, celat omnia. Sic enim Homerus, nescio quo interpretante in Hymn. ad Merc.:

Editus is mane citharam pulsavit eadem

Luce, boves Phœbi celavit vespere raptas.

—Quid tum deinde! Redit jam Sol aut Apollo vultu minaci, boves simul inveitæ, sed nec risu abstinuit ille, quum eundem, qui boves amoverat, suam ipsius pharetram, id est, radios suos simili fraude, si libuit, surripere atque occultare, posse intellexit. Omnibus denique quot tetigerat, ut ait Lucianus, ab infantulo illo furcifero furatis atque absconditis, Neptuni scilicet tridente—Martis gladio,—Veneris cestu—Vulcani forcipibus—Apollinis pharetra—Jovis ipsius sceptro—postremo *fulmen* etiam aggressus ille, hoc subito ardentius esse sensit quam quod digitis conveniret.—Ille nimirum plane hæreremus, atque ista temere omnino et inepte effutiri putarem, ni mythologicam mentem recte calleamus; dato autem filo, sensus adest aptissimus atque concinnissimus, nempe cum alia omnia occultent tenebræ, Jovis tamen fulgura noctem obscurissimam, nubes densissimas, facillime penetrare et perrumpere.

Alium jam proferamus charactera.

Te canam magni Jovis et Deorum
Nuncium.

Bene sane—Deorum enim tam opera quam consilia secreta esse, eorumque mandata invisibili quodam atque oculos fallenti modo absolvi debent. Adde quod noctu per somnia adhiberentur plerumque Deorum τὰ θεοπρόπια. Si autem reliquorum Deorum tum præsertim et quasi κατ' ἐξοχήν, nuncius est magni Jovis, cujus stuprationes et adulteria noctis ministerii primopere indigere existumes. Cum enim aliis furtis tum præcipue Veneris adeo favent tenebræ, ut senex Terentianus adolescentem pæne excusatum habeat, si diceret, Persuasit Nox, Amor, Vinum, Adolescentia. Quapropter forsitan, quod parum olfecere interpretes, Mercurium Veneri adjunxit Horatius noster (Od. 30. L. 1.)

Gratiæ—tecum—properentque nymphæ,
Et parum comis sine te Juventus
Mercuriusque.

Jovis igitur nuncius est Mercurius præcipue in re amatoria. Sin allegoriam hanc pemitus inspiceres, eodem redit; universe quidem

mœchatur Jupiter, at non sine Mercurio, hoc est, vis naturæ generativa partus suos clam hominibus promovet.

Huc omnino referenda est, unde titulus Ἀργειφόντης, fabula. Io, ut aiunt nonnulli, terra est, Argus cælum, oculi ejus sidera.—Esto—Jam Mercurius, ut delirant nonnulli, quia Sol est, eximio suo splendore lumina hæc extinguit. Vah! commentum futile atque insulsum! Quasi Io, sive terra, sive vacca sit, interdiu minus quam nocte lucida cerneretur! aut quasi nunquam, nisi per solis ortum, obscurari possint sidera! Mirum item in hac re vacillare interpretes, quando aperte asserit Ovidius

—Centumque oculos *nox* occupat una.

Met. v. 721.

—Liceat nostram jam invicem aptemus interpretationem. Vaccam hanc, Jovis pellicem, non enim hic de terra, sed de pellice agitur, ita suspicatum habuit Juno, ut eam semper coram in oculis retinere cupiens, Argo, id est, cælo stellato custodiendam tradiderit—Sensus est—Ne noctu abriperetur Vacca, Juno, quæ est aer,¹ noctes semper lucidas aut sidereas intulit—Hoc ægre ferens Jupiter, Mercurium, id est, noctem tenebrosam, nubesque piceas, quibus uxoris spes artesque frustrarentur, inducere curavit.

Ad Odes hujus initium, quod, quasi obscurioris quodammodo interpretationis, huc deferendum judicavi, jam tandem redeundum est.

Mercuri facunde, nepos Atlantis,
Qui feros cultus hominum recentum
Voce formasti catus, et decoræ
More palæstræ,
Te canam—curvæque lyræ parentem.

Atlantem ipsum,

—Cinctum assidue cui nubibus atris

Piniferum caput,

Æn. 4. v. 248.

minime incongruum huic nostro avum esse, nihil jam moror. At “Eho,” inquires, “quid autem de scientiis? Hæ proculdubio *luci* magis quam *obscuritati* adsimilandæ.”—Certe, si perfectionem, minime vero si primordium respicias. Nihil prorsus ex seipso originem ducit; vix enim mundum ex ordine, solem e luce, originem traxisse dixeris; eadem lege nec scientias e doctrina aut lumine, sed maxime ex ignorantia aut tenebris extitisse atque emicuisse judicaveris.

Hermetem jam attendamus terminalem Harrisianum.² Trunco ejus rudi atque infabricato denotantur quasi literarum principia. Hic latent velo mystico obvoluta, scientiarum omnium elementa; velo item amoto eadem panduntur; lux tenebris succedit, adeo ut doctrina ex incitia, cultus e feritate, eloquentia e balbutie, originem traxisse videantur. Recte igitur eo nomine Mercurius scientiarum

¹ Ἄηρ per transpositionem Ἡρα.

² Vide Harris's Hermes, p. 325.

auctor videatur; rectè feros hominum recentiorum animos persuasione humanitatem versus allicuisse, dein musica rhetorica scientiisque aliis societates instruxisse, et vitam perpolivisse, necnon palæstræ decora exercitatione membra formasse dicatur, quandoquidem e tenebris primum hæ omnes effulsere.

Nec unica reddenda est ratio. Novimus ex qualitatibus alias primarias esse, alias secundarias; quod et hic forsitan accommodari potest. E cælo descendit non Γνωθὶ σεαυτὸν tantum, sed etiam Γνωθὶ ἅπαντα. Quare facillime qui Deorum, unde omnis derivata cognitio, interpret et internuncius est, scientiarum etiam repertor atque conditor habeatur. Primum itaque Deorum nuncius est, quia mandata eorum clam omnibus perficiuntur; dein scientiarum inventor, quia has Deorum nuncium attulisse convenit. En tibi binæ interpretationes, quarum utralibet, ni fallor, ad nodum solvendum sufficiat.

Sin scientiarum auctor sit Mercurius, non ideo iis illum præsidere necesse est; nec cum caligine hoc congrueret. Musices, verbi gratia, patrociniū Apollini donasse videtur, quum lyram illam quam Poeta noster fraternam¹ appellat, largitus est. Male igitur, ut opinor, concentui illi septem planetarum, a quo septem chordas deducit Pythagoras, nonnulli Mercurium præfecere. Spherarum certè Apollo præses est et choregus; idem musices patronus sit, si libet; nostrum hunc non nisi testudinis inventorem jactitamus,

—Curvæque lyræ parentem.

Habemus igitur Hermetem alipedem, præpetem, velocissimum, eundemque truncatum, informem, immobilem; quæ res merito Criticis injecit scrupulum. Liceat autem ex altera parte Deorum nuncium, ex altera scientiarum quasi fontem reconditum agnoscamus, inde alia liquido sequi. Mercurius alatus est, quia Deorum mandata retardari nequeunt; item per figuram terminalem intelligendum est, scientias in elementis adhuc latentes justa sua atque legitima forma carere. Denique figuram hanc vel ideo obtinere dicas, quod in tenebris evanescant membrorum distinctiones.

Hactenus ex Ode nostra insigni vel propria depromsimus vel extrinsecus aliena ei aptavimus. Omnia item insuper, ni fallor, eodem spectant quotquot alibi reperiuntur indicia; ne autem plus æquo materiam producam, quod superest paucis expediam.

Quando de furtis jam supra facta est mentio, non adeo mira videbitur forsitan aut intempestiva abhinc in mercaturam transitio; eoque magis dicas quod per Mercurium lucrum præcipue iniquum, celatum, fraudulentum, significari constat. Quidquid igitur arcani, reconditi, mystici sit in re mercatoria, id illi merito attribuas, qui idem cum a mercibus Mercurius, tum a dolo nonnunquam Dolius nuncupatur. Hinc per Ἐρμεῖον lucrum inopinatum, præter expectationem oblatum, *improvisum* intellexerunt veteres.

Alis, ut jam vidimus, petaso, caduceo, talaribus, instructus est Mercurius, non tantum, ut aiunt interpretes, quia Deorum nuncius

¹ Lib. 1. Od. 21. v. 12.

est, sed etiam quia lucrum, præsertim si inopinatum fuerit, neglectum evolat. Adde jam, si libet, quia Nox ipsa "dea nigris obsita pennis," omnia circumvolitans terris quasi imminet atque incumbit — quia nempe, perinde ac ovis gallina, sic tam terris quam "ponto Nox incubat atra."

Somni item, quod plane tenebrarum est, adprime artifex et minister haberi potest Mercurius. Non enim somnum ipsum Morpheus, at, ut nomen suum indicat, imagines tantum, phantasmata, τὰς μορφαῖς, somniantibus admovet. Sic etiam Ovidius

— Simulatoremquæ figuræ

Morphea.

Benè igitur Ἑρμῆς ab antiquis pro ultimo potu usurpatus, quod nempe Mercurio ut somni præsidi libarent e cœna surgentes.¹

Hactenus, ut videtur, res bene convenit. Quo autem pacto sonnum *abstrahere* potest Deus ille umbrarum? Ait enim Virgilius (Æn. 4. v. 244.)

Dat somnos adimitque.²

Dat certe, quomodo autem adimit? At quidni, siquidem ab Horatio Sol diem celare dicitur?

Alne Sol, curru nitido diem qui

Promis et celas.

(Carm. Sæc.)

Quemadmodum igitur Sol oriens diem aperit, occidens claudit, ita Mercurius, quum caliginis numen sit, vel noctem, vel somnos noctis comites, accedens infert, decedens secum abstrahit.

Somnum, ut perhibent auctores, strictum caduceo suo ingerit. Aliud autem mirificæ hujus virgæ officium est quod rixas componat: ea nempe fretus Mercurius, cum serpentes duos præliantes cohibuerat, eos exinde virgæ suæ obvolutos gerebat. Caduceus dicitur, ut aiunt nonnulli, quod cadere faciat contentiones; unde fit ut legati, τῇν εἰρη-νικὴν lancee præ se ferentes, caduceatores³ appellentur. Quid demum hoc caligini aptius? quid accommodatius? Nox prælia dirimit; interposito scilicet tenebrarum suarum quasi clypeo contentiones acerrimas ulterius progredi vetat. Quod nec in iris præsentibus tantum obtinet, sed et irarum causæ in posterum oblivione conduntur.

Proinde de Lyra dicit Poeta noster, (L. 3. Od. 11.) hæc fretum Mercurium, tam manes pœnis agitato, quam Cerberum rabie frementem blanditiis suis mulcere posse et delinire.

Cessit immanis tibi blandienti

Janitor aulæ

Cerberus; quamvis furiale centum

Muniant angues caput ejus, atque

Spiritus teter, saniesque manet

Ore trilingui.

¹ Vide Steph. Lex. ad verb. Ἑρμῆς.

² Vide etiam Hom. Il. 24. v. 343.—Ov. Met. 2. v. 735.

³ Caduceatores pacem, Feciales bellum ferebant.

Quin et Ixion Tytiosque vultu
Risit invito : stetit urna paulum
Sicca, dum grato Danaï puellas
Carminē mulces.

Quæ quidem quid sibi velit fabula usque Criticis in occulto esse constat.¹ Sin caliginem intelligas, expeditur nodus—caligo nimirum et somnum et quietem secum afferens, maximos sane pœnas rependentium dolores, maximam custodum ferocissimorum vigilantiam tandem aliquando compescit atque exsuperat.

Extremum quod rei fidem faciat argumentum jam exinde proferamus, quod Pan Mercurii filius habeatur; et quandoquidem in eo quod modo notavi, Horatium, ut videtur, illustrasse mihi contigerit, dabitur hic insuper, ni fallor,

Quamvis haud equidem tali me dignor honore,
vel Homeri ipsius defendendi copia! Per Pana nimirum universam naturam designari liquet, cujus ita imaginem pinxerunt veteres ut quidquid in mundo quaquaversum sit in ea ostenderetur. Cornua habet in radiorum solis et cornuum lunæ similitudinem—corpus hispidum propter arbores et virgulta—pedes caprinos terræ soliditatem imitantes;—et reliqua deinceps. Hæc quidem sententia, cui et bene quadrare videtur etymon Panis, ex his Orphei abunde stabilitur :

Πανά καλῶ κρατερόν τε θεόν, κόσμοιο τὸ σύμπαν,
Οὐρανόν, ἡδὲ θάλασσαν, ἰδὲ χθονὰ παμβασιλείαν,
Καὶ πῦρ ἀθάνατον· τάδε γὰρ μελῇ ἐστί τὰ Πανός.

Jam si ortum suum respiciamus, Pana hunc, talis cum sit, fere omnes, Homero duce, interpretes Mercurii filium esse perhibent : ait enim poetarum disertissimus, in Hymn. ad Pan. :

Ἑρμείας φίλον τόκον ἔννεπε, Μοῦσα.

Nec tamen desiderantur quibus, ob rei incitiam, minime arrident hæcce generis cunabula, quique multo satius judicant quod yates antiquissimi, et inter primos Memphici, *ιεροφάντης* templi, tradidere, Pana nempe e Chao et Dæmogorgone natum fuisse, noctemque universam partum ejus præcessisse. Euge jam! nonne hi tum maxime nobiscum faciunt, quum in ipsam Homerum vellicandum et exprobrandum se accingunt? Quid enim est Mercurius nisi Chaos illud informe, tenebris penitus involutum et absconditum? Quid insuper Dæmogorgon, nisi vis naturæ generativa ceu vitalis, omnium rerum mater atque altrix, cujus ope Pan a Mercurio, totum videlicet, quod aspiciamus, systema mundanum e caligine impenetrabili eliciebatur? En igitur Noctem istam, ante mundi partum, *τὴν ἀνήλιον*,² opacissimam, universam! cui autem luminis aliquantulum vel ideo inferre conati sumus, ut Horatianum illum a tergo sequi videremur, qui

Non fumum ex fulgore, sed ex fumo dare lucem

Cogitat, ut speciosa dehinc miracula promat.

Hor. de Art. Po. v. 143.

—Quid ais, mi Quintili? Nonne hic mythus perspicacissimus, ele-

¹ Vide Spencii Polym. p. 106.

² Non igitur Phœbus, sed Mercurius e fratribus natu major.

gantissimus, ipso dignus Mæonide! Nec est, ut opinor, quin celeberrimo e nostratibus poetæ libenter accinamus, ubi dicit, "Non bonus quidem dormitat Homerus, nos autem somniamus."¹

Abi jam, Atlantide, et amico charissimo, eruditissimo, salutem defer; qui siquidem ingenuis me insererit criticis, vel Elea viderer redimitus lauro—sin minus, in promptu proverbium est; "Ex quovis ligno non fit Mercurius."²

HERMETICUS.

LOCI QUIDAM LUCIANI EMENDATI ATQUE EXPLANATI

A JOANNE SEAGER, A. B.

BICKNOR. WALLICÆ IN COMITATU MONUMETHIÆ RECTORE.

No. VI.—(Continued from No. XXIX. p. 155.)

I. DE SALTATIONE pag. 302. (p. 940. ed. Salmur.) ἐπεὶ δὲ κατὰ τὸν Νέρωνα ἔσμεν τῷ λόγῳ, βούλομαι καὶ βαρβάρου ἀνδρὸς τὸ ἐπὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ ὀρχηστοῦ γενόμενον εἰπεῖν, ὅπερ μέγιστος ἔπαινος ὀρχηστικῆς γένοιτ' ἂν. Legendum haud dubie βούλομαι καὶ βαρβάρου ἀνδρὸς τὸ ἐπὶ τοῦ ὀρχηστοῦ ΛΕΓΟΜΕΝΟΝ εἰπεῖν: nam dictum, non factum, narrat Lucianus.

II. DE SALTAT. p. 303. (p. 941. ed. Salmur.) ἡ δὲ πλείστη διατριβὴ καὶ ὁ σκόπος τῆς ὀρχηστικῆς, ἡ ὑπόκρισις ἐστίν, ὡς ἔφην, κατὰ τὰ αὐτὰ καὶ τοῖς ῥήτορσιν ἐπιτηδευομένη καὶ μάλιστα τοῖς τὰς καλουμένας ταύτας μελέτας διεξιούσιν. οἶδε γοῦν καὶ ἐν ἐκείνοις μᾶλλον ἐπαινουμένη τῷ εἰκέναι τοῖς ὑποκειμένοις προσώποις, καὶ μὴ ἀπὸδᾶ εἶναι τὰ λεγόμενα τῶν εἰσαγομένων ἀριστέων, ἢ τυραννοκτόνων, ἢ πενήτων, ἢ γεωργῶν, ἀλλ' ἐν ἐκάστῳ τούτων τὸ ἴδιον καὶ τὸ ἐξαίρετον δείκνυσθαι.

Conjecit Solanus Οἱ δὲ γοῦν καὶ ἐν ἐκείνοις ἐπαινούμενοι vel ἦδε pro οἶδε. Pro οἶδε malebat Gesnerus εἴωθε. Emendabam olim, διεξιούσιν 'ΑΤΕ γοῦν καὶ ἐν ἐκείνοις μᾶλλον ἐπαινουμένη—sed mihi nunc locus nec mutationis, nec interpretationis egere videtur; quippe sic jam recte conversus a Gronovio: *Novit enim se in illis magis laudari, eo quod similis plane sit subjectis personis.*

DE SALTAT. p. 306. (p. 944. ed. Salmur.) ἤκουσα δὲ τινος καὶ περιττότερόν τι νεανιευομένου ὑπὲρ τῆς τῶν ὀρχηστικῶν προσωπειῶν σιωπῆς, ὅτι καὶ αὐτὴ πυθαγορικόν τι δόγμα αἰνίττεται. Hoc loco de re aliqua arti saltatoriae peculiari agit Lucianus; sed τῇ ὀρχηστικῇ non proprium esse τὰ προσωπεῖα ejus [*its masks*] silere, manifestum est; nam προσωπεῖα omnia semper silent. Legendum itaque, ὑπὲρ τῆς τῶν ὀρχηστικῶν ΠΡΟΣΩΠΩΝ [*characters, actors*] σιωπῆς.

¹ 'Nor is it Homer nods, but we that dream.' Essay on Crit.

² Adagium hoc Theophrasteum, Οὐκ ἐκ πάντος ξύλου Ἑρμῆς ἂν γένοιτο. Vide Erasm. Adag.

DE SALTAT. p. 309. (p. 947. ed. Salmur.) καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ παχέος δὲ καὶ πιμελοῦς ὀρχηστοῦ πηδᾶν μεγάλα πειρωμένου, δεόμεθα, ἔφασαν, φεῖσθαι τῆς θυμέλης. τὸ δὲ ἐναντίον τῷ πάντῳ λεπτῷ ἐπεβόησαν, καλῶς ἔχε, ὡς νοσοῦντι. Rectius forsā sic, ΤΩ δὲ ἘΝΑΝΤΙΩ, τῷ πάντῳ λεπτῷ, ἐπεβόησαν Καλῶς ἔχε, ὡς νοσοῦντι.

DE SALTAT. p. 314. (p. 952. ed. Salmur.) οὐ γὰρ ἀρκεσθεῖς τούτοις ὁ γενναῖος, ἀλλὰ καὶ μακρῷ τούτου γελοϊότερον ἐπραξε.—Reponendum οὐ γὰρ ἮΡΚΕΣΘΗ τούτοις ὁ γενναῖος, ἀλλὰ—κ. τ. λ. Vel potius οὐ γὰρ ἀρκεσθεῖς τούτοις ὁ γενναῖος, ἈΛΛΑ, καὶ μακρῷ τούτου ΓΕΛΟΙΟΤΕΡΑ, ἐπραξε.

DE SALTAT. p. 315. (p. 952. ed. Salmur.) καὶ αὐτὸν (saltatorem, qui, Ajacem furiosum saltans, ita modum excessit, ut ipse furere visus sit) μέντοι φασὶν, ἀνανήψαντα, οὕτω μετανοῆσαι ἐφ' οἷς ἐποίησεν, ὥστε καὶ νοσῆσαι ὑπὸ λύπης, ὡς ἀληθῶς ἐπὶ μανίᾳ κατεγνώσμενον. Malim, ὡς ἈΛΗΘΕΙ ἐπὶ μανίᾳ κατεγνώσμενον.

EUNUCHUS. p. 353. (p. 976. ed. Salmur.) καὶ ἄχρι γε τοῦ του γελοῖον οὐδὲν ἦν ἐκείνοις ὡς τὸ φιλοσόφους εἶναι φάσκοντας, καὶ χρημάτων καταφρονεῖν, ἔπειτα ὑπὲρ τούτων, ὡς ὑπὲρ πατρίδος κινδυνευούσης, καὶ ἱερῶν πατρώων, καὶ τάφων προγονικῶν, ἀγωνίζεσθαι. Si ἐκείνοις retineamus, ejiciendum ὡς: sed mihi videtur Lucianum scripsisse καὶ ἄχρι γε τούτου γελοῖον οὐδὲν ἦν, ἘΚΕΙΝΟΥΣ, ΟΥΤΩΣ φιλοσόφους εἶναι φάσκοντας, καὶ χρήματα καταφρονεῖν, ἔπειτα—κ. τ. λ. Sequitur statim;

(EUNUCHUS p. 353.) καὶ μὴν καὶ τὸ δόγμα τοῦτό γέ ἐστι τοῖς Περιπατητικοῖς, τὸ μὴ σφόδρα καταφρονεῖν χρημάτων, ἀλλὰ τρίτον τι ἀγαθὸν καὶ τοῦτο οἶσθαι.—Rescribendum Καὶ μὴν καὶ ΤΙ δόγμα τοῦτο γέ ἐστι τοῖς περιπατητικοῖς.

DE ASTROLOGIA p. 362. (p. 985. ed. Salmur.) εὔρον δὲ καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἀστέρων τὴν φορὴν τοὺς δὴ πλανήτας ἡμεῖς καλούμεν (μοῦνοι γὰρ τῶν ἄλλων ἀστέρων κινέονται) φύσιν τε αὐτέων, καὶ δυναστείην καὶ ἔργα τὰ ἕκαστος ἐπιτελέουσιν. ἐν δὲ καὶ οὐνόματα αὐτέοισιν ἐπέθεσαν. (ἐν δὲ καὶ οὐνόματα—Corruptas censeo has voces. Solanus.) Reitzius voluit οἱ δὲ καὶ οὐ νόματα.—Emendo ipse ἘΤΙ δὲ καὶ οὐνόματα αὐτέοισιν ἐπέθεσαν.

DE ASTROLOG. p. 363. (p. 986. ed. Salmur.) ναὶ μὴν καὶ ταῦρον ἐς τιμὴν τοῦ ἡερίου ταύρου σεβίζονται. Putabam Καὶ μὴν verum esse: sed edd. et cod. ms. Marcianus habent ναὶ μὴν. sic infra p. 989. E. ed. Salm. ναὶ μέντοι καὶ Δαίδαλον τὸν Ἀθηναῖον.

DE ASTROLOG. p. 364. (p. 986. ed. Salm.) καὶ οἱ ἐκεῖ μαντήιον τε ἀνατιθέασι σημήϊον τῆς ἐκείνου τοῦ ταύρου μαντικῆς. Fors. καὶ οἱ ἐκεῖ μαντήιον γε ἀνατιθέασιν.

DE ASTROLOG. p. 364. (p. 987. ed. Salmur.) καὶ γὰρ τὸ Λιβύων μαντήιον τοῦ Ἀμμωνος, καὶ τοῦτο ἐς τὸν ἥερα καὶ ἐς τὴν τουτέου σοφίην εἶρητο παρὰ τὸν Ἀμμωνα. καὶ οὗτοι χρηπρόσωπον ποιοῦνται. Gruetus legit ἥεργο, Solanus τὸν γὰρ Ἀμμωνα, Gesnerus

παρ' ὃ τὸν Ἀμμωνα. Cogitaveram ipse, καὶ τοῦτο ἐς τὸν ἥερα καὶ ἐς τὴν τουτέου σοφίην ἩΡΕΙΤΟ. ΚΑΙ τὸν Ἀμμωνα καὶ οὗτοι κριο-
πρόσωπον ποίεονται.

DE ASTROLOG. p. 365. (p. 988. ed. Salmur.) ἡ δὲ λύρη, ἐπτάμιτος εὐῶσα, τὴν τῶν κινεομένων ἀστέρων ἀρμονίην συνεβάλλετο. ταῦτα Ὁρφεὺς διζήμενος, καὶ ταῦτα ἀνακινέων, πάντα ἔθελγε καὶ πάντων ἐκράτεεν. οὐ γὰρ ἐκείνην τὴν λύρην ἔβλεπεν, οὐδὲ οἱ ἄλλης ἔμελε μουσουργίης, ἀλλ' αὕτη Ὁρφέως ἡ μεγάλη λύρη. Ἕλληνες τε, τάδε τιμέοντες, μοίρην ἐν αὐτῷ οὐρανῷ ἀπέκριναν. καὶ ἀστέρες πολλοὶ καλέονται λύρη Ὁρφέως.—Corrigo μοίρην ΑΤΤΗΗ (τῇ λύρῃ scil.) ἐν οὐρανῷ ἀπέκριναν.

DE ASTROLOG. p. 367. (p. 990. ed. Salmur.) εἰσὶ δὲ, οἱ καὶ κατὰ μέρεα τὴν ἐπιστήμην διελόντες, ἕκαστοι αὐτεῶν ἄλλα ἐπενοήσαντο, οἱ μὲν τὰ ἐς τὴν σεληναίην, οἱ δὲ τὰ ἐς Δία, οἱ δὲ τὰ ἐς ἥλιον, συναγείραντες δρόμους τε αὐτέων περὶ κινήσεως, καὶ δυνάμεως. Refingendum censeo: οἱ μὲν τὰ ἐς τὴν σεληναίην, οἱ δὲ τὰ ἐς Δία, οἱ δὲ τὰ ἐς ἥλιον συναγείραντες, Δρόμου τε αὐτέων πέρι, ΚΑΙ κινήσεως καὶ δυνάμεως.

DE ASTROLOGIA p. 371. (p. 994. ed. Salmur.) καὶ ἐπειδὴ ἐς τὸν χῶρον ἦλθεν, ἔνθα ἡ Κίρκη ἐσήμνηε, καὶ ἔσκαψε τὸν βόθρον, καὶ τὰ μῆλα ἔσφαξε, πολλῶν νεκύων παρσόντων, ἐν τοῖσι καὶ τῆς μητρὸς τῆς ἑαυτοῦ τοῦ αἵματος πεινῇ ἐθελόντων, οὐ πρότερον ἀφῆκεν οὐδενί, οὐδὲ αὐτῇ τῇ μητρὶ, πρὶν Τειρησίην γεύσασθαι, καὶ ἔξαναγκάσαι εἰπεῖν οἱ τὸ μαντήιον. Legendum πρὶν Τειρεσίην ΓΕΥΣΑΙ, καὶ ἔξαναγκάσαι εἰπεῖν οἱ τὸ μαντήιον. γεύσαι est γεύσθαι ποιῆσαι. βούλει σε γεύσω πρῶτον ἄκρατον μέθυ; Eurip. Cyclops. 149. Τειρησίην accus. est post γεύσαι.

DE MONAX. p. 379. (p. 1002. ed. Salmur.) καίτοι ἐν ἀρχῇ προσέκρουε τοῖς πολλοῖς αὐτῶν, καὶ μῖσος οὐ μῖον τοῦ παρὰ τοῖς πλήθειςιν ἐκτέσατο, ἐπὶ τε τῇ παρρήσίᾳ, καὶ ἐλευθερίᾳ. Gesneri notis nondum lectis, conjeceram, sicut ille, μῖσος οὐ μῖον τοῦ Σωκράτους παρὰ τοῖς πλήθειςιν ἐκτέσατο. sed non opus, modo vocem τοῦ omni accentu privemus. “non minus odium sibi conciliavit quam civis alius.”

DE MONAX. p. 384. (p. 1006. ed. Salmur.) καὶ μὴν, ἔφη, εἰ κατανοήσεις τὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων πράγματα, εὖροις ἂν αὐτὰ οὔτε ἐλπίδος, οὔτε φόβου ἄξια, παυσαμένων πάντως καὶ τῶν ἀνισρῶν, καὶ τῶν ἡδέων.—imo ΠΑΤΣΟΜΕΝΩΝ.

DE MONAX. p. 388. (p. 1010. ed. Salmur.) ἐπεὶ δέ ποτε πλεῖν μέλλοντι αὐτῷ διὰ χειμῶνος, ἔφη τις τῶν φίλων, οὐ δέδοικας, μὴ, ἀνατραπέντος τοῦ σκάφους ὑπὸ ἰχθύων καταβρωθῆς; κατὰ ἀγνώμων ἂν εἴην. ἔφη, ὀκνῶν ὑπὸ ἰχθύων καταδασθῆναι, τοσούτους αὐτὸς ἰχθὺς καταφαγών.—Malim ΚΑΙ ΓΑΡ ἀγνώμων ἂν εἴην ἔφη.

DE MONAX. p. 389. (p. 1011. ed. Salmur.) ἰδὼν δέ τινα τῶν εὐπαρύφων, ἐπὶ τῷ πλάτει τῆς πορφύρας μέγα φρονοῦντα, κύφας αὐτοῦ πρὸς τὸ οὖς, καὶ τῆς ἐσθῆτος λαβόμενος, καὶ δείξας, ἔφη, τοῦτο

μέντοι πρὸ σοῦ, πρόβατον ἐφόρει, καὶ ἦν πρόβατον.—Emendandum, τοῦτο μέντοι πρὸ σοῦ πρόβατον ἐφόρει, καὶ NTN πρόβατον. Subaudi φόρει.—πρόβατον, posteriori loco, pro *Fatuus, Insulsus*.

AMORES. p. 397. (p. 1019. ed. Salmur.) πάνυ δὴ με ὑπὸ τὸν ὄρθρον, ἡ τῶν ἀκολάστων σου λόγων αἰμύλη, καὶ γλυκεῖα πειθῶ κατεύφρανεν. ὥστ' ὀλίγου δεῖν Ἀριστείδης ἐνόμιζον εἶναι σοῖς μιλησιακοῖς λόγοις ὑπερχηλούμενος.—Legendum ὥστ' ὀλίγου δεῖν ἈΡΙΣΤΕΙΔΗΝ ἐνόμιζον εἶναι.—adeo ut *pene existimarem te Aristidem esse*. Aristidi, ἀκολάστων βιβλίων scriptori, similior qui narrabat, quam qui auscultabat tantum, amores.

AMORES. p. 398. (p. 1019. ed. Salmur.) ἄχθομαί τε νῆ τοὺς σοὺς ἔρωτας, οἷς πλατὺς εὐρέθη σκοπὸς, ὅτι πέπαυσαι διηγούμενος. καὶ σε πρὸς αὐτῆς ἀντιβολοῦμεν Ἀφροδίτης, εἰ περιττά με λέγειν ἔοικας, εἰ τις ἄρρην (proh pudor!) ἢ καὶ νῆ Δία θῆλυς ἐφείται σοι πόθος, ἡρέμα τῇ μνήμῃ ἐκκαλέσασθαι.—Corrupta haec sic emendari posse judico: καὶ σε πρὸς αὐτῆς ἀντιβολοῦμεν Ἀφροδίτης, ἦν περιττά ΜΟΙ ΣΕΒΕΙΝ ἔοικας κ. τ. λ.

AMORES. p. 399. (p. 1020. ed. Salmur.) οὐ γὰρ Ἡλιάδης ἐγὼ τις, οὐδὲ Λημνιάδων ἔρις, οὐδὲ Ἱππολύτειον ἀγροικίαν ὠρφουμένος, ὥς ἐρεθίσαι τῆς θεοῦ τὴν ἀπαυστον ταύτην ὀργήν.—Pro ἔρις reponit Solanus τις, Reitzius εἰμί. malim οὐ γὰρ Ἡλιάδης ἐγὼ τις, οὐδὲ Λημνιάδων ΓΕ ΤΙΣ.

AMORES. p. 403. (p. 1023. ed. Salmur.) πᾶσαν οὖν ἐπιτιμήσεως ἀφορμὴν ἐκ ποδῶν ἀποθέμενος, ἃ παρ' ἀμφοῖν ἤκουσα λεγόντων, κατὰ τὸ ἀκριβὲς ἐπέξειμί σοι.—Edi debuit ἹΠΟΤιμήσεως. quod habent Marcianus cod. MS., Oxoniensis, MS., et margo edit. Aldinae prim. ὑποτίμησις est πρόφασις, Excusatio, Causatio.

AMORES. p. 413. (p. 1032. ed. Salmur.) ἐπὶ θατέρου μηροῦ (statuae puta) σπῖλον εἶδομεν, ὥσπερ ἐν ἐσθῆτι κηλὶδα. ἤλεγχε δ' αὐτοῦ τὴν ἀμορφίαν ἢ περὶ τᾶλλα τῆς λίθου λαμπρότης. ἐγὼ μὲν οὖν πιθανῇ τάληθῆς εἰκασία τοπάζων, φύσιν ᾧμην τοῦ λίθου τὸ βλεπόμενον εἶναι. πάθος γὰρ οὐδὲ τούτων ἐστὶν ἔξω.—In margine ed. Aldinae prim. scriptum est οὐδὲν; quod recipiendum: insuper autem mutandum πάθος in πάλους. ΠΑΘΟΥΣ γὰρ ΟΥΔΕΝ τούτων ἐστὶν ἔξω.

AMORES. p. 417. (p. 1034. ed. Salmur.) καὶ νῦν δὲ τῆς ὑπὸ σοῦ ζηλουμένης Ἀφροδίτης ἐναργὲς ἐστι τοῦτο δεῖγμα. Sententia, mihi non explicanda, flagitat ὑπὸ ΜΟΤ.

AMORES. p. 417 (p. 1035. ed. Salmur.) πολλῶν οὖν ἀκρίτων ἀφυλακτουμένων λόγων, τὸν συμμιγῇ καταπαύσας ἐγὼ θόρυβον, ἄνδρες, εἶπον, ἑταῖροι, τῆς κατὰ κόσμον ἔχουσθι ζητήσεως, ὥς εὐπρεπὴς ἐστι νόμος παιδείας.—Budæus ἀφυλακτουμένων interpretatur “Non observatis et transmissis,” Gesnerus, “Incaute prolatis,” vim verbi neuter forsitan adsecutus. Hoc loco ἀφυλακτεῖν, ut mihi quidem videtur, significat *ELATRARE*, ex ἀπὸ et ὑλακτεῖν compositum.

AMORES. p. 418. (p. 1036. ed. Salmur.) ἐν μέσῳ πάνυ δικαστικῶς καθεζόμεν, αὐτὴν ἐπ' αὐταῖς ὀφρύσιν τὴν ἡλιαίαν ἔχων—Forsan αὐτὴν ἘΠΙ ΤΑΙΣ ὀφρύσιν τὴν ἡλιαίαν ἔχων.

AMORES. p. 419. (p. 1037. ed. Salmur.) ἐπεὶ δ' ἦν ἄπορον ἐξ ἐνός τι γενεᾶσθαι, διπλὴν ἐν ἐκάστῳ φύσιν ἐμηχανήσατο. τοῖς μὲν γὰρ ἄρρεσιν, ἰδίας καταβολὰς σπερμάτων χαρισαμένη, τὸ θῆλυ δ' ὥσπερ γονῆς τι δοχεῖον ἀποφύνασα. Legendum τοῖς μὲν ΓΕ ἄρρεσιν ἰδίας καταβολὰς σπερμάτων χαρισαμένη, τὸ θῆλυ δ' ὥσπερ γονῆς τι δοχεῖον ἀποφύνασα.

AMORES. p. 423. (p. 1040. ed. Salmur.) ἀλλὰ γὰρ ἐνταῦθα τοῖς σωματικαῖς καὶ ὁ θαυμαστὸς ἀναφύεται λόγος, ὃς οὐ παιδικαὶ μὲν ἀκοαί, τελείων ἐνδεεῖς λογισμῶν, φευγαλίαι. τὸ δ' ἤδη κατὰ φρόνησιν ἐς ἄκρον ἔχον, οὐκ ἂν ὑπαχθῆναι δύναίτο. Scripsit, nī fallor, Lucianus τὸ δ' ἤδη κατὰ φρόνησιν ἐς ἄκρον ἮΚΟΝ οὐκ ἂν ὑπαχθῆναι δύναίτο.

AMORES. p. 434. (p. 1050. ed. Salmur.) ἐπειδὴ δὲ αἱ μὲν ἐσπευσμένοι χρεῖαι πέρας εἶχον, οἱ δὲ τῶν ἐπιγιγνομένων ἀεὶ λογισμοὶ τῆς ἀνάγκης ἀφθέντες ἠυκαίρουν ἐπινοεῖν τι τῶν κρειττόνων, ἐκ τούτου κατ' ὀλίγον ἐπιστῆμαι συνήζοντο, τοῦτο δ' ἡμῖν ἀπὸ τῶν ἐντελεστέρων τέχνων ἔνεστιν εἰκάζειν. αὐτίκα πρῶτοί τινες ἄνθρωποι γενόμενοι, τοῦ καθ' ἡμέραν λιμοῦ φάρμακον ἐζήτουν.—Non recte vertit Gesnerus αὐτίκα πρῶτοί τινες ἄνθρωποι γενόμενοι “Vix nati erant primi quidam homines,” &c. αὐτίκα est *Exempli gratia*, *Ac primo quidem*; For instance, for example. χρὴ τὸν ποιητὴν ἄνδρα πρὸς τὰ δράματα, ἃ δεῖ παιεῖν, πρὸς ταῦτα τοὺς τρόπους ἔχειν. αὐτίκα γυναικεῖ ἦν ποιῆ τις δράματα, μετουσίαν δεῖ τῶν τρόπων τὸ σῶμ' ἔχειν. Aristoph. Thesmoph. v. 151. πέτεται, θεὸς ὢν, πτέρυγας τε φορεῖ, καὶ ἄλλοι γε θεοὶ πάνυ πολλοί. αὐτίκα Νίκη πέτεται πτερυγοῖν χρυσαῖν καὶ, νῆ Δί', Ἔρως γε. Aristoph. Avib. 574.

AMORES. p. 439. (p. 1055. ed. Salmur.) Οὐμὴν οὐδ' ἐρίδος γένος ἐστὶν ἐν, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ γαῖαν εἰσι δύο. τὴν μὲν κεν ἐπαινήσει νοήσας, ἢ δ' ἐπιμωμητή. διὰ δ' ἐνδιχα ἄθυμον ἔχουσιν. οὐδὲν οὖν παράδοξον, εἰ πάθος ἀρετῇ κοῖνην προσηγορίαν ἔχειν ἔτυχεν, ὥστε ἔρωτα καλεῖσθαι καὶ τὴν ἀκολαστον ἡδονὴν, καὶ τὴν σωφρονουσαν εὐνοίαν. Post ei addendum forsitan φαῦλον. οὐδὲν οὖν παράδοξον, εἰ ΦΑΥΛΟΝ πάθος ἀρετῇ κοῖνην προσηγορίαν ἔχειν ἔτυχεν.

AMORES. p. 444. (p. 1059. ed. Salmur.) ὦν ἐνίαν οἱ κακοδαίμονες ἄνδρες, οὐδὲ αὐτὰ ἴσασι τὰ ὀνόματα, κωλιάδας εἰ τύχοι, καὶ γενετυλλίδας, ἢ τὴν φρυγίαν δαίμονα, καὶ τὸν δυσέρωτα κῶμον ἐπὶ τῷ ποιμένι.

Theocrit. Id. I. 109. Ὠραῖος χῶδωνις, ἐπεὶ καὶ μάλα νομεύει.

AMORES. p. 445. (p. 1059. ed. Salmur.) θηλότητος εὐνὴν γέμουσαν· ἂρ' ἥς ἀνασταὺς ἕκαστος, εὐθὺ λουτροῦ χρεῖός ἐστι. Imo vero λούτρον χρεῖός· EXEI.

WALCKENAER ON ANCIENT GEOGRAPHY.

A Report (published in 1814) of the works concerning History and Ancient Literature, to which various members of the French Institute had devoted their attention, contains a very interesting account of extensive researches lately made on the old Itineraries of Persia and India; and on the marches of Alexander and Seleucus Nicator. These, and similar researches, were the subject of some Memoirs composed by M. Walckenaer, a learned member of the French Institute, and justly celebrated for his knowledge of Ancient Geography, and his skill in illustrating the classical authors, who treat of that important and difficult science. We are now enabled to present our readers with a notice of those researches, somewhat more detailed than the account above-mentioned. In this Number of our Journal, we mention only the Memoir concerning the ancient Itineraries, and those remarkable passes or defiles to which the Greeks and Romans gave the name of *Pylæ*, or Gates. In a future Number we shall offer some notices of M. Walckenaer's other researches.

THE two last segments of the Peutingerian Table comprise Itineraries in Persia and India, hitherto unexplained; distances which no person has yet been able to combine; and names of places, for the greater part, not found in other monuments of antiquity, nor yet examined by modern writers, nor even registered in those voluminous dictionaries of ancient geography, of which it has been the professed object to collect all the names recorded by old authors, or discovered on medals, and in inscriptions, &c. M. Walckenaer's researches demonstrate that some Itineraries in the Peutingerian Table have been constructed according to those of Alexander's and Seleucus Nicator's marches; that others are precious remains of the documents collected by Eratosthenes, for the composition of his Geography; and finally, that a third portion belongs to the flourishing ages of the Roman Empire. The distances given by the Peutingerian Itineraries agree with those of the marches of Alexander and Seleucus Nicator, and the other measures of the ancients relative to those countries, as preserved by Strabo and Pliny. M. Walckenaer notices the different sources whence these authors derived their materials;—the letters of Alexander the Great;—the description, composed by this conqueror's desire, of the various provinces that constituted his empire;—the journal of Diognetes, and of Bæton;—the relations of Ptolemy, and of Aristobulus; of Nearchus, Onesicritus, Patroclus, Megasthenes, Deimachus, and of Dionysius.

Alexander's letters were still in existence when Pliny and Plutarch quoted them. The description of that monarch's empire, composed at his command, has been communicated to Patroclus by Xenocles,

keeper of the royal treasure. Patroclus himself had governed Babylonia and the countries bordering on the Caspian Sea; he was sent into India by Antiochus Soter. Diognetes and Bæton were the chief persons employed to measure the route of Alexander and of his army. Athenæus has preserved the title of their journal. Ptolemy the son of Lagus, and Aristobulus, were two of Alexander's generals, and participated in the events which their memoirs record. Nearchus and Onesicritus performed themselves that adventurous navigation from the Indus to the Persian Gulf, described in their own journals, which Arrian has preserved, and which Juba, king of Mauritania, abridged. Megasthenes, so often quoted by Strabo, was sent on an embassy to the Indian monarch, Sandrocottus. Deimachus, who, like Megasthenes, composed an account of India, resided in that country as ambassador to the son of Sandrocottus; and Dionysius, whose narrative Pliny has cited, was also a traveller in India, having been sent there by Ptolemy Philadelphus.

From an examination of all these writings, and of the means which their authors employed in obtaining the best information, M. Walckenaer concludes,—“that no part of ancient science is supported on proofs more satisfactory and authentic.” “But,” adds M. W., “if the ancient measures have been taken with exactness, they should present a result corresponding to that given by modern measures, in cases where these have been taken with equal accuracy; and the positions of ancient places as well as of modern, may be determined with precision, by means of this agreement between works executed at epochs separated from each other by intervals of more than sixteen hundred, and more than two thousand years.” Such a result could not have been obtained by means of the modern maps hitherto engraved and published: but the geography of Persia and even of India has within a short time made much greater progress than is generally known. This circumstance M. W. now first exposes in the course of his researches; and we learn that *Manuscript Itineraries* have been communicated to him, constructed with the utmost ingenuity and exactness by the able geographers who accompanied the last ambassador from France to Persia, and by other travellers. M. Walckenaer's work was completely terminated when Mr. Macdonald Kinneir published in London (at the end of 1813) his *Memoir on Persia*, and the map which illustrates it. M. W. does not deny that this map has been useful to him in confirming the exactness of some results already obtained, or in assisting him to obtain others still more exact; “but it bears,” says he, “every character of too great precipitation, and exhibits serious errors which its author might easily have avoided, by combining with more care the materials that he possessed.” M. Walckenaer then examines the advances which the geography of Hindustan has made, since the last edition of Major Rennell's *Memoir and Map*; and he indicates all that afforded him assistance in establishing a solid basis for his researches. These, he informs us, will be comprised in five different *Memoirs*. The object of M. Walcke-

naer in the *first*, is to ascertain the position of the *Caspian Gates*, noticed by Alexander's historians; and to compare with our modern measures those great measures which the ancients have given us relatively to Persia, India, and Bactriana. The *second* Memoir will contain a geographical analysis of some Itineraries in the Peutingerian Table: viz. 1. From Seleucia to the mouth of the Persian Gulf—2. From Babylon to Ecbatana—3. From Ecbatana to Rhagès—4. From Ecbatana to Persepolis. In the *third* Memoir M. W. directs his inquiries to the various roads which branched off from *Rhagès*, from the *Caspian Gates*, and from *Persepolis*, which led into *India* and *Bactriana*, and of which the details are found in Peutinger's Table, in Pliny, and in Strabo. Our learned author's *fourth* Memoir is dedicated to the great Itineraries given by Pliny, and the Table above-mentioned, extending from the *Indus* to *Palibothra*, and from *Palibothra* to the mouth of the river *Ganges*. In the *fifth* and last Memoir M. Walckenaer discusses the Itinerary which the Peutingerian Table furnishes; comprehending the coasts of *Malabar* and of *Coromandel*: he compares the measures yielded by them, with those of the same coasts found in Ptolemy, and in the Periplus of the Erythrean Sea; and concludes with a short geographical analysis of the materials used in the construction of his map, which exhibits all the results of his researches. The first Memoir is entitled, "*De la Position des Portes Caspiennes des Historiens d'Alexandre, et des Mesures générales données par les Anciens, relativement à la Perse, à l'Arie, et à la Bactriane.*" In this, M. W. gives the texts which prove that the ancients took the *Caspian Gates* as a centre for all their measures. He observes that it is not only necessary to find the group of mountains which contained those *gates*, but to ascertain the valley which led to them, the entrance, and the central point of this defile. "The narrow pass of *Khawar*," says M. Walckenaer, "is not that of the *Caspian Gates*, as Rennell, and after him, other modern geographers have believed; but these were situate more towards the north in the same group of mountains, near a place called *Serbend*, (a name which in Persian signifies the '*head of the defile*,') north-eastward of the Ruins of Rhagès, a position which accords with the measures and descriptions of the ancients, whilst the pass of *Khawar*, to the south-east of Rhagès, is too remote, and is also contrary to their texts and measures."

Our author next examines those measures, in appearance contradictory, which Pliny, Strabo, Eratosthenes, and Ammianus Marcellinus, have given between the *Caspian Gates* and *Hecatompylos*; shows that all these agree among themselves, and that their seeming contrariety arises merely from a difference of *modules* in the measures; and that they all agree with our modern maps in placing Hecatompylos at *Dameghan*. To this discussion M. Walckenaer has annexed a map, entitled "*An Essay on the Topography of the Caspian Gates, according to the Manuscript Itinerary of Trezel, the printed Relations of various Travellers, the Turkish*

Geographer, and the Maps of Delisle and of Macdonald Kinneir." This central point being determined, M. Walckenaer examines the great measures given by the ancients, between the *Pylæ Caspiæ* or Rhagès, the mouth of the river Cyrus, the line where India commences, the river Jaxartes, Thapsacus, Pelusium in Egypt, Babylon, Susa, Persepolis, and the extremity of the Persian Gulf. And he shows that they are exactly conformable to the modern maps that have been improved by the latest observations, such as those of Persia by M. La Pie, in the last edition of Chardin's travels, and that of Mr. Macdonald Kinneir. He also proves that the stade of those ancient measures is always the same, that is, the stade of $1111\frac{1}{6}$ to a degree, or equivalent to the *four hundred thousandth* part of the circumference of the earth—that of which Aristotle has given the module, and which Freret, Delisle, D'Anville, Gosselin, and most other learned geographers have considered as the only stade applicable to the marches of Alexander. Thus, as M. W. observes, all of Asia that was known to the ancients is connected with the point of the *Caspian Gates*, of which the longitude and latitude are ascertained by their relations with the points of Pelusium, and other places which the moderns have fixed astronomically and trigonometrically. M. Walckenaer further observes, that we should not be surprised at the exactness of those general measures given by the ancients; they were not only the simple estimates of distances between different places, but, as we perceive by the discussions in which Strabo employed himself, they served as bases for their maps. M. W. therefore examined them with minute attention, before he applied to the details.

He next demonstrates, from the agreement of these measures with the Peutingerian Table, that the Itineraries of this map are the same that Eratosthenes used, and which he styled *anepigraphic*, or "*without title*." This ancient writer is thus justified from the reproaches of Strabo and Hipparchus, who blamed him for having preferred those Itineraries to the measures given by most approved geographers. Had Strabo and Hipparchus known the exactness of those Itineraries, they would, on this subject, have adopted the sentiments of Eratosthenes.

M. Walckenaer remarks that the measures given by the ancients are not always so exact as those which he has above mentioned. The ancients are often deceived both in the module of the stades which they employ, and in the manner of applying them; and, it may be said, in their calculations and their deductions. Of this, M. W. furnishes more than one proof, whilst analysing the discussions of ancient geographers concerning the form which should be given to Persia, to Aria, and to Bactriana. Having explained the causes of that exactness which appears among the ancients, M. W. develops those of their errors—"All which causes," says he, "were common not only to Eratosthenes and Hipparchus, but to all the ancient geographers; they explain the motives of their geographical

combinations, and may serve us in restoring their different systems of geography, with respect both to the coasts and the interior."

This, however, is not immediately the object of our learned author, who, in his present researches, is content to demonstrate, incontestably, that, from the agreement subsisting between the ancient computations and modern documents for general measures, it is possible to ascertain precisely the positions of ancient and modern places, according to the particular measures furnished by the old Itineraries. This task has been performed by M. Walckenaer in his *Researches*, which determine the situations of ancient places by those measures, and confirm them by all the monuments of history.

An observation, which had been made respecting a passage of Pliny quoted in the preceding Memoir, suggested to M. Walckenaer his "Remarks on the Defiles of Caucasus, and on the denominations of *Caspian*, *Caucasian*, *Sarmatian*, and *Albanian* Gates, applied to those different Defiles." In these he has proved that the passage of Pliny, as found in the editions of Hardouin and Brotier, is either without meaning, or has a false and contradictory sense. But M. W. by merely changing the punctuation, without any alteration of the text, establishes the sense of this passage in a manner clear, evident, and conformable to the configuration of the places which Pliny describes. An attentive examination of this passage has led M. W. to a discovery still more important. Pliny here accuses his contemporaries of having erroneously bestowed the denomination of "*Caspian Gates*," on a defile of *Caucasus*, and thus confounding them with the *Caspian Gates*, through which Alexander passed, and which, according to Pliny, were only known in his time from the descriptions left by those historians who celebrated that conqueror's expedition. This accusation, if well founded, would not only fall on Corbulo, who had made war in Caucasus, and transmitted to Rome a plan of the defile in the mountains there, which he styled "*Caspian Gates*," but also on the Emperor Nero, or his ministers, who, in an order given to the army, designated these defiles of *Caucasus*, by the title of *Caspian Gates*. And those personages Pliny reproaches, expressly and by name, for having committed such an error without leaving us ignorant of the means by which they might have obtained better information. Pliny's accusation would likewise affect Strabo, Eratosthenes, Tacitus, Suetonius, and Procopius, who had also fought in this country with Belisarius, and has so well described it. Priscus, also, would incur the blame of Pliny; and he who arranged the Peutingerian Table, and has placed a station called *Caspiæ* evidently in Caucasus. So that every author must have erred except Pliny. But M. Walckenaer proves, from a passage in Strabo, that the chain of *Caucasian mountains* bore among the natives the name of *Caspian mountains*, and this was its most ancient denomination; that one of the loftiest summits of the *Caucasian* hills was particularly styled *Mount Caspian*; that, in short, there was a race of people called *Caspians*, in the country of Caucasus; and that, consequently, the ancient authors were

not wrong in giving to the defiles of *Caucasus* the name of *Caspian Gates*, although those defiles were very different from the *Caspian Gates* of Alexander's historians. The charge of incorrectness, therefore, must fall on Pliny himself, who, in this passage, has undertaken with such an air of authority to censure others. Modern writers, however, and those especially who have composed dissertations, *ex professo*, to illustrate the denominations of *Caucasian*, *Albanian*, and *Caspian* gates, deceived by the tone of assurance which Pliny adopted, have taken his remark as the basis of their decisions. Like him, they condemn the ancient authors whom they endeavour to explain and correct after their own fashion, and from this have resulted errors fatal in their consequences respecting many points of considerable importance in ancient history. It was through the defiles of *Caucasus*, that those Nomades of northern Asia have often passed, to make such terrible irruptions into the civilized nations of the south, as in different ages have so changed the face of the world. These defiles are thus connected with the most important epochs of history, and their names are always found in recitals of the greatest revolutions and most extraordinary events. These Researches, therefore, must be highly interesting, which restore to many passages of the ancient writers, that clearness of which they had been deprived; and, particularly, rectify an error first committed by an ancient author, and allowed to subsist during the course of nearly eighteen hundred years.

ON THE SCIENCE

OF THE EGYPTIANS AND CHALDEANS.

Part II.—[Continued from No. XXXI. p. 160.]

THE statements which I have made of the calculations of the ancient Orientalists, and especially those which I have cited on the authority of Eratosthenes and Aristotle, must appear extraordinary, and may perhaps appear suspicious, to those who have been accustomed to think contemptuously of the knowledge of the Egyptians and Chaldeans. If my conclusions be just, the sages of Egypt and the East had determined, with as much accuracy as the moderns, the distance of the sun from the earth, and the circumference of this terrestrial globe; and should this statement be founded on truth, it will be difficult to deny that the exact sciences were cultivated in former ages with as much success as at present;

nor ought this to appear wonderful, since no kingdom of modern Europe has flourished for so long a period as Egypt did, from the age of Misraim to that of Cambyzes, including nearly seventeen centuries; or as the Assyrian empire, which lasted for at least 1200 years, from Ninus to Sardanapalus; or as the kingdom of Babylon, which was established by Belus, from whose reign to the time of Cyrus we cannot reckon less than 1700 years. But in order to enable those, who have not examined the measures employed by the Greeks in stating dimensions, altitudes, and distances, to judge of my reasoning, it is necessary that I explain myself distinctly concerning the stadium. The subject is, I admit, extremely dry; and I shall therefore endeavour to be as brief as I possibly can be with perspicuity; but as this measure perpetually recurs in the language of astronomers, as well as in that of geographers, it is very necessary that we should ascertain the meaning, or rather the various meanings, of this important word. I explain it as follows.

When the Greeks made computations of any considerable extent from their own observations, or when they thought it necessary to reduce Oriental measures to their own standards, in order to assume to themselves the merit of having made any particular calculation, they generally reckoned by the Olympic stadium. The celebrated D'Anville estimates this stadium, which contained 600 Greek feet, at $94\frac{1}{2}$ toises, or 567 French feet, equal to 605 English feet and a fraction, reckoning the English foot at 1000, and the French at 1068, as their relative proportions. But D'Anville has made this calculation in reckoning by the short Greek foot, which Dr. Greaves calculates to have been to the English as 1007 to 1000, though even this difference, small as it is, be probably greater than the truth. I find, however, that it was the long Greek foot, which was reckoned for the Olympic stadium. Dr. Arbuthnot thought that this long Greek foot exceeded our English foot by 875 decimals of an inch; but this estimate appears to me to be too high. The Olympic foot contained 4 palms, and the palm in question here was the $\delta\omicron\chi\mu\eta$, or $\delta\alpha\kappa\tau\upsilon\lambda\omicron\cdot\delta\omicron\chi\mu\eta$,—the breadth of the 4 fingers compressed, equal to about 3 English inches, and nearly one 8th of an inch. Consequently the Olympic stadium, containing 600 of these long Greek feet, was equal to nearly 625 English feet, or

perhaps fell beneath that measure by a very few lines. It was by this measure of 600 long Greek feet, that Herodotus reckoned when he gave the height of the pyramids in the lake Moëris at one stadium; and Eratosthenes, either from the desire of being considered as the author of the calculation, or from the fear of being accused of excessive exaggeration, probably brought the Oriental stadium, equal to 330 short Greek feet, to the Olympic stadium of 625 feet, when he gave the distance of the sun from the earth at 804,000,000 stadia. Even this statement so much alarmed the copyists, that they threw it out of Plutarch's text, and, had it not been for the translation of Xylander, we should not have known that it had ever existed. But² is clear that Xylander must have found this statement in the original, from which he made his version.

Again, when the Greeks spoke of distances measured by strangers, and when they did not think it necessary to speak with precision, or supposed that they would be understood by their countrymen without appealing to their own peculiar standard, they still employed the word stadium to express proportions of extent, which, though very different from that of the Olympic stadium, yet came nearer to it than to any other itinerary measure for which they had a name in their language. Thus they used the word stadium to denote portions of the Eastern mile, of the Persian parasanga, and of the Egyptian schoenus, though one of these portions exceeded, and all the rest (some of them very considerably,) fell beneath, their own standard. The French Academicians have reckoned, besides the Olympic stadium—one of 114 toises, or 684 French feet, equal to 729 English feet—one of 85 toises, or 510 French feet, equal to 545 English feet—one, equal to 483-495, or 500, or 505 English feet—one of 68 toises, equal to 435 English feet—and of one $51\frac{1}{2}$ toises, equal to about 330 English feet.

The stadium of 729 English feet, or 114 toises, was an itinerary measure of Asia Minor. It seems to have been designed to give the 27th part of an Egyptian schoenus, or 20th of a Persian parasanga, or 9th of an Eastern mile. Perhaps it may be the stadium reckoned at 1000 feet, natural measure, by Censorinus. Bailly says it was the same with the Alexandrian stadium, in which supposition he follows Le Roy, though, I believe, Thomas Smith,

an Englishman, was the first who ascertained the existence of this stadium.

Cassini pointed out another stadium of 85 toises 3 feet 7 inches, or 513 French feet 7 inches, equal to 548 English feet, 8 inches. Bailly tells us, that this stadium was the 30th part of a parasanga; but, for reasons which I shall state in the sequel, I must reject this computation. The stadium in question was an approximation to the 36th part of a schoenus, and to the 27th part of a parasanga. Posidonius assigned 240,000 of these stadia to the circumference of the earth; and in reckoning 668 to the degree, the error for the whole circumference of the globe will not amount to 120 miles.

D'Anville estimates at about $75\frac{1}{2}$ toises, (about 483 English feet,) the stadium, which he considered as equal to the 10th part of a Roman mile. But, I think, he has shortened this stadium too much. It might nearly answer to the 10th part of a Roman mile, without being rigorously exact; for it does not appear to have been originally a Roman measure, and was apparently in previous use among the Greeks. It seems to me, that this was the stadium generally understood by Xenophon. D'Anville observes, that the distance from Gesoriacum navale (Boulogne sur mer) to the Rutupiæ statio (Richborough) was always reckoned at 450 stadia, and that the measured distance amounts to between 33 and 34,000 toises. This gives a result of from 74 to $75\frac{1}{2}$ toises to the stadium. But 34,000 toises amount to 217,600 English feet, about 1120 feet above 41 English miles. Now, as nearly as I have been able to examine and calculate the distance between the two places, I should reckon it to be greater by at least 2000 feet, supposing the sea to have once washed the very walls of Richborough castle, which, I think Camden says, was a mile from the shore in his time. Without following D'Anville through his calculations, I must observe that other respectable writers assign 500, and even 505 English feet to this stadium. Major Rennell says, that the stadium calculated on the 150th part of a mean march of his scale would be 493 feet. But after having examined the question with all the attention in my power, I would fix this stadium at 495 English feet; and I hold it to have been originally an Eastern measure, often entering into the calculations of the Greeks, and answering precisely to the 40th part of a schoenus, and to the 30th part of a parasanga. Major Rennell says, that the stadium employed by Xeno-

phon might be reckoned at 750 to the degree; but when Xenophon spoke of the stadium, equal to the 30th part of a parasanga, I am inclined to reckon it at 740 to the degree.

The stadium of 68 toises (about 435 English feet) was an approximation to the 34th part of a parasanga, and to the 46th of a schœnus.

We now come to the stadium reckoned at $51\frac{1}{2}$ toises, or 309 French feet, or perhaps rigorously something more, and rising above, rather than falling under, 330 English feet. This stadium bore a manifest proportion to that of 495 feet, and answered precisely to the 45th part of a parasanga, and to the 60th part of a schœnus.

It follows, that I reckon the parasanga at 14,850 feet, and the schœnus at 19,800. I estimate the parasanga at more than 3 Roman miles, because it was equal to 3 long Persian miles, or to 9000 long Persian cubits, as is evident from the tables of Abulfeda. Now the modern Persians estimate their ancient cubit at 8 digits more than their present, which I estimate as not quite equal to 15 English inches, being less by a very minute fraction of an inch. The ancient cubit then, according to their reckoning, will be something less than 20 of our inches, but more than $19\frac{3}{4}$. Consequently 9000 cubits of this measure may be estimated at about 14,850 feet—since the parasanga by this rate was more than 14,750 feet, and less than 15,000.

Shah Cholgi has estimated the circumference of the earth at 8000 parasangas, reckoning 22 parasangas and a fraction to the degree. The error for the whole circumference of the earth is so great, as to prove that the Persian astronomer could not have measured an arch on the meridian with any sort of accuracy. Upon what principle then did Cholgi make his reckoning, for it is evident that he set out upon certain data, from the exactness with which he calculates, and brings out the round number of 8000 parasangas, by the fractions of miles and cubits added to each of the 22 parasangas for each degree. It is well known that the Persian astronomers copied, as nearly as they could, the disciples of the Alexandrian school, and that they preserved many things by tradition from that school. We have seen above, that Posidonius calculated the earth's circumference at 240,000 stadia. I cannot help suspecting, that Cholgi had the tradition of this measurement, which probably was not originally made by Posidonius; and that

he was aware that it was made by a proportion of the parasanga. But the most common partition of the parasanga by stadia was into 30 parts; and Cholgi, not being aware that Posidonius had employed another ratio, mistook the stadium of 548 feet, equal to the 27th part of a parasanga, for the stadium of 495 feet, equal to the 30th part. Now mark the result:—240,000 stadia, multiplied by 495, will give exactly 118,800,000 feet; and 14,850 will give as precisely 118,800,000 feet.

The schœnus has been generally reckoned equal to 4 Roman miles. The estimate among us of one M. P. is 967 English paces, each pace equal to 5 feet. 4 M. P. are therefore equal to 3868 English paces, or 19,840 English feet. I reckon the schœnus at 19,800 feet. The excess of 460 feet over 4 M. P. is proposed with the full conviction of its being necessary to adjust the measure. . . Most assuredly the schœnus, and 4 Roman miles, had an accidental coincidence more or less exact. It would be idle to suppose, that where a distance lay between 19 and 20,000 feet—between 4 Roman miles and a schœnus—which supposes a yet smaller difference, that a Roman, in his itinerary, would much hesitate in resolving the Egyptian into the Latin measure. How often does an Englishman reckon the French league at 3 English miles! The difference between a schœnus and 4 M. P. amounts to nothing like this. But I shall now place before my readers a table of the relative proportions of the different stadia to the schœnus, to the parasanga, and to each other.

TABLE.

The reckoning according to English feet, inches, &c.

Egyptian schœnus=19,800 feet.	Persian parasanga=14,850 feet.
Four Roman miles=19,340 feet.	Three Roman miles=14,505 feet.
Stadium of 729 feet, multiplied by 27=19,683 feet.	Stadium of 729 feet, multiplied by 20=14,580 feet.
Olympic stadium of 625 feet, multiplied by 32=20,000 feet.	Olympic stadium of 625 feet, multiplied by 24=15,000 feet.
Stadium of 548 feet, 8 inches, multiplied by 36=19,751 feet.	Stadium of 548 feet, 8 inches, multiplied by 27=14,814 feet.
Stadium of 495 feet, multiplied by 40=19,800 feet.	Stadium of 495 feet, multiplied by 30=14,850 feet.
Stadium of 435 feet, multiplied by 45=19,575 feet.	Stadium of 435 feet, multiplied by 34=14,790 feet.
Stadium of 330 feet, multiplied by 60=19,800 feet.	Stadium of 330 feet, multiplied by 45=14,850 feet.

We now see, why Herodotus reckoned the schœnus at 60 stadia, Eratosthenes, in one instance, at 40, and Pliny at 32. Herodotus meant the stadium of 330 feet; Eratosthenes that of 495 feet; and Pliny the Olympic stadium. Again, when Herodotus spoke of the parasanga as equal to 30 stadia, he had in view the stadium of 495 feet. But in order better to show the application of these different stadia to the same dimensions, let us turn, by way of example, to the accounts which the ancients have given us of the vast capital of Chaldea.

Herodotus tells us, that the whole extent of the walls of Babylon amounted to 480 stadia. On the other hand Diodorus Siculus, where he follows the authority of Clitarchus, who had resided at Babylon, and Strabo, (for so the text should be corrected) reckon the whole extent of the walls at 365 stadia. Now it is clear to me, that Herodotus made his calculation by the stadium of 330 feet, which was equal to the 45th part of a parasanga, and that Diodorus and Strabo made theirs by the stadium of 435 feet, which was an approximation to the 45th part of a schœnus, but which gave almost exactly the 34th part of a parasanga. According to the first of these writers, the walls were 158,400 feet, precisely 30 English miles in extent; and, according to the two last, the extent amounted to 158,775 feet, making little more than half a furlong of difference.

We may be almost certain, that when Strabo stated the breadth of the Euphrates at Babylon at one stadium, he spoke of the stadium of 435 feet, because Mr. Rich measured the stream at Hellah, and found it to be 450 feet in breadth, when the river was apparently a little above its usual height.

I am inclined to think that the tower of Belus, which formed a square of one stadium for its base, and which, with seven towers raised one above another upon this base, was also one stadium in height, was not 500 feet in any of its dimensions, because the extent of its mass of ruins, which ought to be considerably greater than the extent of its original site, does not authorise us to calculate this stadium at more than the length of the stadium of 435 feet.

I am well aware that I have differed in these statements, not only from Freret, D'Anville, and Bailly, but more essentially from Major Rennell. This gentleman, in his very valuable work on the

geography of Herodotus, reckons, as a mean, about 718 stadia to the degree, and estimates the general rate of the stadium at 500 feet. That there existed a stadium nearly of this measure, though I would rather reckon it at 495 feet, and that this stadium was in very general use as an itinerary measure, I think undeniable. I have no doubt myself, that it answered to the 30th part of a parasanga; and that it was the stadium by which Xenophon, in particular, commonly reckoned; and, therefore, admit its general use: but, when Major Rennell goes so far as to hold, that the Olympic stadium was never employed as an itinerary measure; when he regards the stadium of Aristotle, valued at 1111 (rather 1112) to a degree, as merely imaginary; and when, in short, he rejects every stadium proposed by Cassini, Freret, D'Anville, and other writers, in favour of that of 500 feet, I find it impossible to agree with him. I would ask this acute and able writer, if we reject the stadium of 330 feet, as well as the Olympic stadium, how are we to reconcile the Greek authors, who have stated so differently, according to appearances, the length, for example, of the coast of Egypt, from Plinthine to the lake Serbonis? According to Herodotus, the extent is 60 schœni, which he reckons at 3600 stadia;—after correcting an error in Strabo, his computation gives 1970 stadia. If the stadium in both cases be reckoned at 500 feet, a difference is here exhibited, which is utterly unaccountable. Herodotus is precise; he repeats this calculation. Strabo and Diodorus differ from each other only by 30 stadia. Now let us suppose, that Herodotus reckoned by the stadium of 330 feet, and Strabo by the Olympic stadium, and the difference between them dwindles, comparatively speaking, to a trifle—it will amount to little more than 8 miles for the whole coast of Egypt, with all its sinuosities included.

No one will deny that the Olympic stadium was employed in measuring dimensions, since Herodotus used it to denote the height of the pyramids in the lake Mœris. But why, I would ask, was this historian so very particular in his description of this stadium, if he did not mean distinctly to mark, that it was different from that by which he had been estimating the circuit of the lake, which circuit he makes equal to the extent of the whole Egyptian coast, 3600 stadia? It is difficult to imagine this, even in reckoning the stadium only at 330 feet; but if it be reckoned at 500 feet, this

lake must have been about 341 English miles in circumference ; and, all matters considered, this is quite incredible. But I shall now proceed to show, that there is good reason for thinking, that there really was an itinerary measure, both in Egypt and in Chaldaea, equal to 330 feet.

The word *schœnus* (σχοῖνος) is said, in a passage in Plutarch, to be of Persian origin ; and the Coptic word **CHAYZ**, which signifies a chain, or cord, may have come from the same source. But if this word were originally Persian, we may consider it as at least highly probable, that the measure also was introduced by the Persians, after Cambyses had added Egypt to the provinces of his empire. Now I shall proceed to show, that the Chaldeans had one itinerary measure equal to the third part of a *schœnus*, and another equal to the sixth part of a *schœnus*, each of which they partitioned into 10 parts ; whence it follows, that the 10th part of the first measure was equal to the 30th part of a *schœnus*, and that the 10th part of the second measure was equal to the 60th part of a *schœnus*.

I shall endeavour to explain this matter with as much brevity as possible ; but in making such an analysis, it is not easy to avoid some tedious details. The Orientalists reckoned their stadia, (I can find no other word to express my meaning,) by cubits, as the Greeks reckoned theirs by fathoms and by feet, and the Romans by paces. Some writers think, that the Egyptian and Chaldean cubits were the same. The Egyptian cubit called *drah*, which word is used by the Persians (دراخ), is estimated by Bishop Cumberland at $21\frac{9}{10}$ English inches, and by Freret at $20\frac{544}{1000}$ French inches. Both these calculations seem to me to be too high. D'Anville calculates the Egyptian cubit at 19 French inches and 8 or 9 lines, and the Chaldean cubit at 19 French inches. This again is probably below the standard. I consider the Chaldean and Hebrew cubits to have been the same. There were two Chaldean, and two Jewish cubits. Herodotus says, that the royal Chaldean cubit was longer by three digits than the common. According to Ezekiel, the long Hebrew cubit was longer by a palm than the common cubit. This palm was the short palm, and may be proved to be so from Jerom ; and therefore should have rather been rendered *δακτυλο-δύχμη* than *παλαιστή*, equal to four digits. But He-

rodotus may not have known the precise difference between the two Chaldean cubits; and there are very powerful arguments to show, that the Chaldean and Hebrew cubits were the same. Ezekiel evidently spoke with the intention of conveying very exact information.—“And these are the measures of the altar by cubits, the cubit being a cubit and a palm.” Now it is to be remembered, that this was written at Babylon, and was addressed to the Jews who had been long settled there. These Jews were already half Chaldaized. Even the prophet himself introduces the Chaldaic idiom into his writings, as is evident from the sense in which he uses the word **כַּף** in the very verse from which I have been quoting. The cubits of which he spoke were clearly Hebrew cubits, because Hebrew measures alone were employed in the construction of the temple, of the altar, and of the ark. If, then, the Chaldean and Hebrew cubits had been different, it cannot be supposed that the prophet would have failed to have remarked it to the Babylonian Jews. No doubt he would have said, these cubits must not be mistaken for the Chaldean cubits, with which you have been accustomed to measure since the captivity. It is scarcely possible to suppose, if any difference had existed between the Hebrew cubits, and those in general use at Babylon, that this remark would have been omitted. I likewise find, that Jerom translates **אמה ומפח** (a cubit and a palm,) *cubitus verissimus*; and what can be understood by this, unless it be, that such was the standard cubit both in Palestine and Assyria. But if any doubts yet remain on the subject, let us turn to the decree of Cyrus, in Ezra. There the word **אמין**, cubits, is clearly Chaldaic. Now if the 60 Chaldaic cubits allotted for the site of the temple, had not exactly corresponded with 60 Hebrew cubits, can it be supposed that Ezra would have said nothing on the subject? Would Josephus have translated this decree, and yet not have remarked, that the cubit in the second temple was not the same with that which had been received as a measure in the first? I cannot believe it, and therefore I hesitate not to affirm, that the Hebrew and Chaldaic cubits were the same.

We are now to consider the exact length of the Hebrew long cubit, equal to the Chaldean royal cubit. The ark is stated, in Exodus, to have been two cubits and a half in length; and Josephus says that its length was five spans. Consequently the cubit was

precisely two spans in length. But the word *σπιθαμή*, used by Josephus, answers to the Hebrew *זרת*, which, I believe, is always rendered *σπιθαμή* by the LXX. In the tables for Greek measures, however, I find the *σπιθαμή* set down as equal to 9 English inches 656 decimals, reckoning 1000 parts to the inch; and in the tables for Hebrew measures, the *זרת* is made equal to 10 English inches 944 decimals. If these accounts be accurate, then Josephus has stated the ark to be at least half a foot shorter than it really was according to scripture; and this error occurs in a measure of only two cubits and a half! But, if this difference had really existed, would not the accuracy of the antiquarian, and the piety of the Jew, have induced Josephus to have said, the length of the ark, though exactly equal to five Hebrew spans, which make two cubits and a half, must be reckoned at five Greek spans and two palms? I believe that the length of the *σπιθαμή* is accurately stated at 9 English inches 656 decimals; but when the zereth is reckoned at almost 11 English inches, I cannot agree to the estimate, because then both Josephus and the LXX must be often accused of very inaccurate calculations. If, therefore, we reckon the zereth to have exceeded 10 English inches by 4 or 5 decimals, in counting the inch at 1000 parts, it is as much as can be well allowed, for even at this rate we shall have a giant's span, and exceeding the common measure of the human foot. Thus, however, we shall have two Hebrew spans, or the Hebrew cubit, equal to 20 English inches 8 or 10 decimals. It has been argued, that the cubit of $20\frac{544}{1000}$ French inches, which is said by Freret to have been the length of the Egyptian cubit, must have been also that of the Jews and Chaldeans. We might as well contend, that the Winchester bushel must be the bushel of Cork and Aberdeen. In reckoning the *σπιθαμή* at $9\frac{656}{1000}$ English inches, and the *זרת* at $10\frac{944}{1000}$ English inches, the excess of the Hebrew span over the Greek will not be so great as to make it surprising that it was not noticed by Josephus and the LXX; but had the *זרת* been equal to $10\frac{944}{1000}$, the case would have been different.

The long Jewish, or Chaldean mile contained 4000 cubits; and was divided into 10 parts or stadia, each consisting of 400 cubits. The short mile, otherwise called the Sabbath-day's journey, was precisely the half of the long mile, and was divided into 10 parts, or

stadia, each containing 200 cubits. Allowing $20\frac{10}{1000}$ English inches to the Chaldean cubit, we have, for each of these stadia of 200 cubits, about 330 English feet. It follows, that the stadium of the long Chaldean mile, made the 30th part of a schoenus; and that the stadium of the short Chaldean mile answered to the 60th part of the same measure:— $22\frac{1}{2}$ of these long, and 45 of these short stadia were contained in a parasanga.

It was by the stadium of the short Chaldean mile that Herodotus appears to have counted, when he reckoned the extent of the walls of Babylon at 480 stadia; and I think that it was likewise by this measure, that Aristotle, upon the reports perhaps of Callisthenes, and apparently taken from the Chaldean mathematicians, reckoned the circumference of the terrestrial globe at 400,000 stadia.

The Persian parasanga (فرسنگ), or pharsank (فرسنگ), consists, as I have already stated, of 9000 long cubits, containing 32 digits each; but as each of these digits contains only the measure of the breadth of 6 barley-corns, some difficulty occurs in settling the precise length of the cubit. The long Scripture cubit has been estimated at $19\frac{880}{1000}$ English inches in some of the tables. I think this is too short for the Hebrew measure, and I conclude that the calculation has been founded on the Persian measure. Thevenot, in counting barley-corns, which was not the way to get at the exact truth, since the measure which is fixed must be fictitious, determined the Persian cubit to be equal to 18 French, or $18\frac{102}{1000}$ English inches. I would rather take the measure as set down in the tables, with the slight difference of about the 34th of an inch; and, rejecting Thevenot's calculation, I would reckon the long cubit, called the black, at 19 inches and 850 decimals. But the parasanga contains exactly 3 miles, and each of these miles contains 3000 long cubits; whence it follows, that the long Persian mile (میل) holds the middle place between the long and the short Chaldean miles. The long eastern measures, therefore, seem to have borne relations to each other, which have not yet, perhaps, been investigated with sufficient precision.

September, 1817.

W. DRUMMOND.

P. S. In my last article an error has occurred, in stating the number of English miles, at which Eratosthenes, in calculating the distance of the sun from the earth, had really estimated that distance. The number of stadia, reckoned by that philosopher, between the earth and the sun, amounted to 804,000,000, and each stadium consisting of 625 English feet, the distance should have been stated at 95,170,454 English miles, instead of 95,193,000. It is always painful to have committed a mistake; but I find some consolation in having again to call the attention of the reader to this calculation, which Eratosthenes must have had from Oriental tradition, and which could not have been a mere guess. Let the scientific reader decide, how far it attests the progress of knowledge in the ancient kingdoms of Egypt and Babylon. The distance, assigned by modern philosophers to the sun from our planet, has been stated, since the transit of Venus in 1769, at 95,173,000 English miles.

W. D.

CORRECTIONS

In the common Translation of the New Testament.

No. IV.

ST. JOHN.

CHAPTER I. v. 5. *comprehended*, prevented.

v. 9. *lighteth every man, that cometh into the world*, came into the world to enlighten every man.

v. 14. *as*, indeed.

v. 15. *this was*, this is.

v. 17. *grace and truth*, the grace and the truth.

v. 21. *that*, the.

v. 25. *that prophet*, the prophet.

v. 33. *and remaining on him*, and remaining.

v. 35. *Again, the next day after, John stood, and*, The next day, John being there again, with.

v. 40. *him*, Jesus.

v. 43. *a stone*, a rock.

CH. II. v. 2. *And both Jesus was called, and his disciples*, And Jesus and his disciples were invited.

v. 3. *And when they wanted wine*, And the wine failing.

v. 4. *what have I to do with thee? My hour is not yet come*,

why dost thou concern thyself with me? Is not my hour now come?

v. 6. *was, were.*—after the manner of the purifying of the Jews, for the Jewish purification.

v. 9. *ruler, governor*—the governor of the feast, he.

v. 18. *what sign showest thou unto us, seeing that thou doest,* by what sign showest thou thy right to do.

v. 22. *believed,* comprehended.

v. 23. *at the passover, in the feast-day,* at the feast of the passover.

CH. III. v. 10. *a master,* the teacher.

v. 13. *which is,* who was.

v. 21. *truth,* righteousness.

v. 23. *they,* many persons.

v. 25. *Some of John's,* John's.

v. 28. *but that I am,* but am.

v. 32. *no man receiveth,* few men receive.

v. 33. *hath set to his seal,* hath sealed his persuasion.

CH. IV. v. 1. *When therefore the Lord knew how,* Jesus then, knowing that.

v. 3. *he left,* left.

v. 9. *dealings,* connexion.

v. 10. *gift,* favor.

v. 22. *ye know not what,* what you know not.

v. 27. *the woman,* a woman.

v. 46. *he made,* he had made.

v. 54. *This is again the second miracle that,* this second miracle.

CH. V. v. 9. *on the same,* that.

v. 14. *findeth,* found.

v. 16. *did the Jews persecute,* the Jews persecuted.

v. 21. *raiseth up the dead and quickeneth them,* raiseth the dead to life.

v. 27. *the son,* a son.

v. 39. *Search, You search.*—in them ye think, by them you profess to believe that.—*they are they which,* they.

v. 40. *And,* yet.

CH. VI. v. 14. *should,* was to. (et passim)

v. 19. *see,* saw.

v. 21. *went,* were going.

v. 22. *was,* had been.

v. 32. *that,* the.

v. 33. *he,* that.

v. 45. *man therefore,* man (omit therefore passim).

v. 59. put a comma after taught.

v. 61. *When Jesus knew,* Jesus knowing.—*he said,* said.

v. 70. *and,* and yet.

CH. VII. v. 4. *and he himself seeketh to be known openly,*
 who seeks to be publicly known.

v. 13. *of him,* in his favor.

v. 17. *will do,* intends to do.

v. 22. *Moses therefore,* Thus Moses.

v. 23. *at, with.*—*made a man every whit whole,* healed the whole body of a man.

v. 33. *unto them,* unto the people.

v. 45. *and they,* who.

v. 50. *saith unto them* (*he that came to Jesus by night, being one of them*), one of them (*he who came to Jesus by night*) said to them.

v. 52. *for out of Galilee ariseth no prophet,* that a prophet ariseth not from Galilee.

CH. VIII. v. 24. *he,* what I am.

v. 26. *and to judge of you,* against you.—*of him,* from him.

v. 33. *they,* the Jews.

v. 38. *seen with,* learnt from.

v. 43. *hear,* bear.

v. 46. *convinceth,* convicteth.

v. 56. *rejoiced,* earnestly desired.

CH. IX. v. 8. *that he was blind,* blind.

v. 17. *that he,* who.

v. 22. *he was,* Jesus was.

v. 24. *was,* had been.

v. 26. *never die,* not die for ever.

v. 27. *ye did not hear,* did you not hear it?

v. 30. *why,* herein, here indeed.

CH. X. v. 8. *for me,* assuming my character.

v. 17. *that I might,* so as I can.

v. 22. *winter,* rainy weather.

v. 25. *they bear,* bear.

v. 26, 27. *as I said unto you. My sheep, My sheep,* as I said unto you.

CH. XI. v. 10. *no light in him,* no light.

v. 17. *that he,* that Lazarus.

v. 25. *were dead,* should die.

v. 28. *she went her way,* she went.

v. 39. *he hath been dead four days,* this is the fourth day.

CH. XII. v. 1. *which had been dead, whom he raised from the dead,* whom he had raised from the dead.

v. 6. *bag, purse.*—*bare,* carried away.

v. 9. *much people,* many. (*et passim*).

v. 10. *consulted, that they might,* resolved to.

v. 11. *went away,* left them.

v. 16. *and that they had done these things unto him, and had been done to him.*

v. 24. *a corn, a grain.—abideth alone, remaineth single.*

v. 27. *what, what!*

v. 31. *Now is the judgment of this world, Now is this world to be judged.*

v. 32. *if I be, when I am.*

v. 49. *he gave, gave.—say, teach.*

CH. XIII. v. 2. *supper being ended, during supper.*

v. 3. *went, was going.*

v. 4. *He riseth, rose.—garments, mantle.*

v. 5. *poureth, poured.*

v. 21. *testified and said, declared.*

v. 24. *should be, was.*

v. 31. *Therefore when, When.*

v. 33. *Little children, My dear children.*

CH. XIV. v. 2. *if it were not so, I would have told you, behold, I tell you.*

v. 3. *if I go and prepare, when I have gone and prepared.*

v. 10. *he doeth, doeth.*

v. 14. *If, When.*

v. 17. *ye know him, and he dwelleth, you will know him, and he will dwell.*

v. 19. *Ye see, You shall see.*

v. 26. *he shall, shall.*

CH. XV. v. 2. *purgeth it, purgeth.*

v. 6. *cast forth, cast out.—and men gather them, and cast them into the fire, and they are burned, and it is gathered, cast into the fire, and burned.*

v. 11. *might remain in you, in you may remain.*

v. 13. *a man, he.*

v. 20. *kept, observed.—keep, observe.*

v. 24. *both seen and hated, seen them, yet they have hated.*

CH. XVI. v. 2. *cometh, that, is coming when.—doeth God service, offereth a sacrifice to God.*

v. 8. *reprove, convince.*

v. 25. *proverbs, parables.—show you plainly of the father, give you a plain account of the father.*

v. 26. *I say not, I need not say.*

CH. XVII. v. 9. *I pray not, I pray not now.*

v. 11. *own name, those whom, authority, which.*

v. 12. *in thy name, by thy authority.*

v. 13. *might have my joy, may have their joy in me.*

v. 22. *given me: for thou lovedst me before, given me, for thou lovedst me, before.*

CH. XVIII. v. 14. *which gave, who had given.*

v. 25. *and, as.*

v. 28. *defiled: but that they might eat*, defiled, and rendered unfit to eat.

v. 37. *Art thou a King then?* Thou art a King then?

CH. XIX. v. 24. *rent, rend.—that the scripture might be*, so that the scripture was.

v. 40. *as the manner of the Jews is to bury*, according to the manner of embalming among the Jews.

v. 41. *in the place*, near the place.

v. 42. *There they laid Jesus therefore, because of the Jews preparation day, for the sepulchre was nigh at hand*, There, as this sepulchre was near, they laid Jesus, on account of the preparation of the Jews.

CH. XX. v. 6. *cometh, came.—seeth, saw.—clothes lying*, clothes.

v. 9. *knew not*, had not understood.

v. 19. *were assembled for fear*, were assembled, for fear.

v. 27. *faithless*, incredulous.

v. 31. *might, may.—believing*, by your belief.—*might, may*.

CH. XXI. v. 7. *his fisher's coat unto him*, on his fisher's coat.

v. 11. *for all*, although.

v. 16. *again the second time*, the second time.—*feed*, tend.

v. 21. *what shall this man do*, what will become of this man?

v. 24. *every one*, separately. C. P.

ON THE CHARACTER OF PLUTARCH, AS AN HISTORIAN.

*With Remarks on some of the “Lives of the illustrious
men” of Greece.*

“There is a history in all men's lives

Figuring the nature of the time deceas'd.” 2. Hen. iv. 3. 1.

PART I.

ALTHOUGH none of the works of Plutarch rank him in the list of professed historians, yet it cannot be necessary to show the intimate connexion, which subsists between the duties of the writer of history and those of the writer of biography. This most especially takes place, when the subjects of the biographer have

been public characters, and have performed the first parts in the drama of the day. It is then, that he has a double duty to perform: he ought not only to exhibit the moral and intellectual character, the private and domestic actions, but likewise to enter into the details of the public transactions, in which his hero has been concerned. It does not hence follow that the biographer must be the historian of the times, in which the public character has figured: when, indeed, that character, as often happens in Plutarch, has been the chief director of the energies of his nation, the mover and adviser of all the political measures of the day, the sphere of the biographer is considerably enlarged; but even then his duty only leads him to notice the transactions, in which the subject of his memoirs was involved, and to show their relative importance and connexion. For it belongs to him not only to raise the superstructure of his actions, but also to exhibit a scale by which its parts may be measured, and the size of the whole ascertained. Though one particular phænomenon may be the object of exhibition, yet he must fill the unoccupied parts of the canvas with other objects and other figures, not merely to relieve the eye, but to show the keeping of the whole.

It would be a truism to observe that the biographer is as responsible for the truth and fair representation of general history as the details of the individual life. The biographer of a public man is, in fact, as much an historian as the historian of any particular place or time. Plutarch is as much an historian as Bentivoglio or Bishop Burnet. The general historian sets before us the prospect of a wide and extended country; the biographer puts the telescope into our hands; and though the view is limited, yet the part observed is much more minutely and distinctly seen. The one gives us the outlines of kingdoms; the other fills up the details of departments; and each is answerable for the grand features of the country that comes within his observation.

From the works still extant, and from the much greater number we find in the list given by his son, Plutarch appears to have been not only a voluminous, but a very general, writer. He wrote in nearly every department open to the ancient philosopher. In his own time, his works were perhaps more duly appreciated than at present. He met indeed with extensive consideration

in his visits to Rome; but he is seldom mentioned by his contemporaries and the writers in the times immediately succeeding. On the revival of literature a high value was put upon his philosophical writings. In the course of a pursuit, which led me to pay some attention to the moral writings of Plutarch, I became convinced of the fallacy of the many eulogies which I had heard and read of his intellectual power and philosophical spirit. His works are valuable, because in many instances they contain transcripts of the opinions and reasonings of prior and superior philosophers. As literary productions, they should be considered as the contents of his huge common-place books,* selected and threaded together with some ingenuity.† Plutarch, and the many, who have quoted and trusted his lives as authentic history, have erred; he in the design of his history or biography, they in their mistaken view of this design. They have imagined that the truth of history was the object of his research, that he was anxious to illustrate the obscure, to confirm the doubtful, and by a collision of authorities to elicit a fair and veracious account. οὔτε ὡς ποιῆται ὑμνήκασι περὶ αὐτῶν ἐπὶ τὸ μείζον κοσμοῦντες—οὔτε ὡς λογογράφοι ξυνέθεσαν ἐπὶ τὸ προσαγωγότερον τῇ ἀκροάσει ἢ ἀληθέστερον.—He does not seem to have felt that histories of the times, of which he writes, were wanted. He quotes no less in his lives than two hundred and fifty authors, most of whom are historians. “I write lives,” says he, “not histories.” He *certainly* did not write histories, nor can I think his pieces of biography are “lives” properly so called. They are rather *characters* than regular *lives*. One of Plutarch’s principal objects was to describe a character,—to gather the τῆς ψυχῆς σημεῖα—to paint the “portrait de l’âme.” He little regarded historical truth when

* Should this opinion appear severe, and draw down the anger of the admirers of Plutarch, I will shelter myself behind the high authority of Brucker, who, though he did not contribute to form, has confirmed that opinion. Et judicandi quidem facultate, qua polluisse multis videtur, ultra mediocritatem non fuisse gavisum, ea, quæ vel ipse tractavit, argumenta modusque ratiocinandi, quem adhibuit, vel quæ ex veterum systematibus descripta, illustravit, satis produnt. Unde si cum Vossio inter philologos et historicos summos referendus est, de quo disceptare nolumus, philosophis tamen illum summis, cum eo adscribere, veritati omnino est contrarium, cum intra mediocritatis limites ejus philosophia consistat.

he had conceived the design of drawing any given character, and was in search of traits to illustrate and support his opinion. It is thus that he disregards all comparative authority, giving in numerous instances more credence to a flying rumour, or to the calumny of an obscure libeller, than to the weighty testimony of Thucydides or Xenophon. Hence he so frequently contradicts himself, presenting us, in two different lives, with two different accounts of the same transaction; sometimes attributing a saying or an action to one man, sometimes to another, as it suited his present purpose; "*tant il vrai*," says Bayle, "*qu'il étoit en possession de faire servir une même historiette à divers usages.*" Barnes, as he is quoted by Bayle, has found the same fault: *Neque enim inusitatum Plutarcho easdem res et sententias aliquando variare, aliquando diversis authoribus tribuere, non memoriâ lapsus, sed ut in rem suam, quam præsens ornat, torqueat.*

Plutarch, though, as I have already observed, to draw characters was his object, has not excelled in the delineation of the character of man as found in the experience of life. His hero is either wholly avaricious, wholly just, cruel, or ambitious. He seems to have held that every man is led by some paramount and uncontrollable passion, to know which, is to obtain the key to all his actions. The name of the individual is in some cases little more than the peg on which he hangs the symptoms of the ruling passion. His heroes are too often like the heroes of the Faery Queen, where "holiness" and "justice" are embodied into knights, and led through a round of allegorical adventures. Plutarch was not acquainted with the wayward nature of man; he had not studied the principles of human action; he did not know that there is no road marked out before us, and that all our actions are but the consequences of circumstances acting upon the strength or weakness of our minds, and the sensibility or obtuseness of our feelings. The nature and species of the mental faculties are never the topics of *his* discussion. It is surprising that Montague, whose mind was so essentially different from Plutarch's, the one being excellent in the very qualities in which the other was deficient, should have thought highly of the "parallels." We must attribute it to the force of early impressions. "Plutarch's lives" was the text-book of his father, when he read him lectures on politics in the course of that

oral or *vivâ voce* education which so materially contributed to form the character of Montagne.—St. Evremond has some observations, which so exactly coincide with my ideas on this head, that I shall indulge myself in the quotation. St. Evremond, though not a *learned man*, as that expression is generally understood, was a deep and lively observer of mankind. Speaking of Plutarch, he says, “*mais je pense qu’il pouvoit aller plus avant et pénétrer davantage dans le fond de la Nature. Il y a des replis et des détours en notre âme, qui lui sont échappés. Il a jugé de l’homme trop en gros, il ne l’a pas cru si différent qu’il est de lui-même, méchant, vertueux ; équitable, injuste ; humain et cruel ; ce qui lui semble se démentir, il l’attribue à des causes étrangères. Enfin s’il définit Catalina, il nous le donne avare ou prodigue ; cet ‘alieni appetens, sui profusus’ étoit au-dessus de sa connoissance, et il n’eût jamais démêlé ces contraires que Salluste a si bien séparés, et que Montagne lui-même a beaucoup mieux étendus.*” Dryden, in his life of Plutarch prefixed to that translation “*by as many hands as lives,*” that “*child of many fathers,*” has taken notice of this passage, and endeavoured to refute it by quoting the character of Sylla. If St. Evremond had been selecting instances, he would have adduced this very character in confirmation of his opinions. It is true Plutarch there mentions many of what he calls “*anomalous*” traits : he makes Sylla haughty, and severe to inferiors, submissive and courteous to superiors, or to those of whom he had something to ask, punishing slight, and overlooking heavy offences ; but he accounts for these contradictions in the very way to which St. Evremond objects. These things, says Plutarch, can only be reconciled by supposing Sylla to have been *naturally* vindictive and cruel, but *occasionally giving way* where *his interest* was concerned.

Plutarch’s principal motive for writing his “*lives*” was the best, —the advancement of virtue. He had two subordinate motives,—to recommend democracy, and to exhibit in a favorable light the illustrious men of Greece. It was his opinion, that the representation of a great and virtuous character, would materially advance the interests of virtue. He did not apprehend that the reality of the individual’s existence, or of the actions he attributed to him, could be of consequence, farther than the belief of it would tend more

effectually to produce imitation. In his life of Pericles, he says that virtue has in itself an attractive power, and that its mere exhibition stirs up a desire of emulation. This may be true, but it is not the spirit in which a biographer, or historian, should set out. He ought not to be in search of virtuous examples, but of truth. To turn over the pages of history in order to white-wash the characters we find there, is not to teach "philosophy by examples," but to eulogize the cardinal virtues under "proper names." The investigation of truth will much more essentially serve the cause of virtue, than any partial representation, which eagerness in looking for, and the difficulty in finding, the virtues personified, might lead him to create. Plutarch himself confesses the difficulty of discovering perfect specimens of virtue, and, in the absence of them, recommends that the brilliant parts of a character be set in a full light, and the defects thrown into the shade. Plutarch is like the artist who, having to draw the portrait of a prince who had lost an eye, took him in profile.

One of the other motives already adverted to, that Plutarch had in writing, which alone would lead us to receive with caution his representations, is, that he was anxious to exalt the fame of his native country by an advantageous comparison of its great men with those of Rome. He saw its degraded state, and its small political consideration; his "*amor patriæ*," of which no man ever felt more, was wounded and indignant; he burned to show that Greece had once been the superior of Rome, if not in national conquests, yet in individual greatness. He had also another motive; he was an ardent lover of republicanism; his little Cheronæa was a republic, and he the first man in it. He knew little of that form of government practically, or he would not have attempted to dress it out in such engaging colours. In common with his contemporary countrymen, and even with the present degenerate race that boast themselves their descendants, he looked with a jealous eye on the despotic power of his masters. They were all proud of their descent, and could talk loud enough, if they could do no more, of the good old times of Marathon and Salamis. Plutarch, in some of his "lives," is a warm advocate of democracy; and it was doubtless with the view of indirectly recommending his favourite form of government, that he chose some of his "lives." Mr. Mitford, in his "*History of Greece*," has mentioned this, and

added the similar case of certain French writers, who, when restrained from meddling with the politics of their own country, eagerly vented themselves in discussions on the freedom, government, and measures of ours. Plutarch, from the time of Petrarch, who I believe is nearly the first that quotes him, on the revival of literature, down to the days of Rollin or even of Gillies, has been extensively held as one of the best authorities, not only for historical facts, but also for their causes, and the order of time in which they happened. He has been cited with Thucydides and Xenophon, and his evidence has been balanced against that of these excellent and trust-worthy historians. Plutarch never intended this; and before his admirers held him up as the most authentic as well as the most entertaining writer, they should have inquired what pretensions he himself advanced. It would be exaggerating to say that our reliance on Plutarch is, as if 1800 years hence the "historical novels," as the phrase is, of the present day should be quoted for the history of Courts, and the private lives of individuals. But we may observe that a similar mistake has been made with regard to the *Cyropædia* of Xenophon, as to the "lives" of Plutarch. Xenophon's life of Cyrus is not *history*, though it has been esteemed such: it is the model of an excellent prince, as the "lives" commonly are models of excellent statesmen and generals.

The Grecian part of the "lives" of Plutarch is much more correct and to be depended upon than the Latin: this may be accounted for from the slight knowledge he had of that language, and of the authors who wrote in it; and perhaps from his taking less interest in the great men of a foreign country. The lives of Aristides, Cimon, and especially that of Pericles, as far as my observation goes, have the fewest of Plutarch's prevailing faults; but even here, how many of the qualifications of the instructive biographer and historian appear to have been wanting? In every work either of history or biography, a constant attention ought to be paid to chronology, and facts should be related in the order of time—each part of their subject should only take up so much space in narration as it is relatively important—trifling and disgusting fables, and irrelevant matter of every description, should be avoided—the most probable causes should be assigned—and that connexion which is found between the various and different acts

of nations and individuals, if possible, should be vigilantly preserved. The *philosophical* historian should also trace to their source, the causes which led to the political and moral changes of the times, should show the point where a nation struck out of the road of its true interest, and where and how it returned. He has likewise to exhibit the effects of the forms and administrations of governments on the manners, morals, and general character of the society for whose good they are created. It would not be too much to say, that Plutarch is deficient in each of these points. His chronology is uncertain, negligent, and confused. Gibbon has objected to Sallust, that, after reading the history of the Jugurthine war, no impression remains on the mind of the reader, of the length of time taken up by the transactions related. After perusing a life of Plutarch, it would in most cases be equally impossible, without previous knowledge, to form an accurate idea of the interval between the first and last act of the individual who is the subject of it. Scaliger, speaking and giving instances of Plutarch's chronological blunders, says: "Neque vero putes Plutarchum *προληπτικῶς* hæc fingere. Summus enim scriptor in his rebus (sc. chronologicis) puer est." To the arrangement of his materials Plutarch paid no attention; he read every thing that was to be read, and then sat down, gorged with an undigested, unruminated mass, to write the life and draw the character of a very just or a very virtuous, a very ambitious or a very cruel man, of an Aristides or a Phocion, of a Themistocles or a Sylla. He quotes from all quarters, for his memory was as strong as his reading was extensive: regardless of authority, he chuses the story for its effect, and so far from arranging his incidents in the order of time, crowds many that are perfectly detached, into the picture before him. He writes, says Bayle, as "qu'il veuille faire un Poème épique."

Count Hamilton, in his well known memoirs of the Count de Gramont, despises all attention to arrangement, and defends himself on the authority of Plutarch. Je déclare de plus, que l'ordre des tems ou la disposition des faits, qui coûtent plus à l'écrivain qu'ils ne divertissent le lecteur, ne m'embarrasseront guères dans l'arrangement—les choses qui le distinguent auront place dans ces fragmens, selon qu'elles s'offriront à mon imagination, sans égard

à leur rang.—Qu'importe après tout par où l'on commence un portrait, pourvu que l'assemblage des parties forme un tout qui rend parfaitement l'original? Le fameux Plutarque, qui traite ses héros comme ses lecteurs, commence la vie des uns comme bon lui semble. This writing is in the very spirit of Plutarch, though assuredly, the "advancement of virtue" was not the motive to write in Count Antony Hamilton.

In an historian of Plutarch's age, nothing can be more disgusting, than the pages filled with details of oracles, dreams, and auguries; which he interprets with all the gravity of a priest of Delphi, instead of showing how far they were believed, how far engines of state. He scarcely seems aware that they were often the tricks of priests, and of the masters of priests. He disbelieved the existence of the gods of his country, and yet he never doubts their oracles. They were striking characteristics of the manners of the times, and as such should be described—they had consequences, and should therefore be mentioned as causes. But not such consequences as Plutarch sometimes attributes to them, can we conceive them to have had. Can we suppose Cimon to have been on the point of abandoning the expedition to Cyprus on account of the vision of the barking dog, which Plutarch tells us how the augur twisted to foretel his death? Was it for the philosophical Plutarch to have related that Cimon was seriously affected by the ill-omened labours of the busy ants, who had contrived to accumulate the clot of blood on his great toe! In Plutarch's puerile treatise against Herodotus, he inveighs against that historian for the introduction of what he calls calumnies, and remarks "that the excursions and digressions of history should be allowed chiefly to fables and antiquities, and sometimes eulogies." It must be on the strength of this, that he introduces the disgusting story of Peripoltas in the beginning of the life of Cimon, and the discussion on the ram's head with one horn sent from the farm of Pericles, with numberless others equally interesting and relative. It was not, as I have before mentioned, Plutarch's object to investigate historical truths, so that it is only very seldom, and that too in points that have been before discussed, or in some antiquarian disquisition, that he enters into that office of the historian which consists in comparing disagreeing testimony, in examining the prejudices, circumstances,

and opportunities of the writers whom he consults, and in extracting the truth by comparison and inference, in striking out fire, to use Bolingbroke's metaphor on a similar occasion, by the collision of flint and steel.—We might have been contented and instructed without any profound assignation of cause, or deduction of consequence, if Plutarch had given but a clear and veracious narration of events in their natural order. But even here he is wanting. If this qualification had belonged to him, it may be that he would not have been so popular, but he would have been more useful—we might then have dispensed with what M. Bougainville complains is not to be found in Plutarch, "*cet enchaînement heureux, ces liaisons naturelles, qui conduisent d'un fait à un autre.*" He goes on to say, "*Les vies des hommes illustres sont des tableaux estimables par le coloris, mais peu corrects, et où l'expression est supérieure à l'ordonnance.*"

The duties of a *philosophical* historian are perhaps more than we should demand of Plutarch; as we find them rarely fulfilled, if ever, by the celebrated writers that preceded him. The "philosophy of history" is a modern term which I believe had its origin with Voltaire. It is the essence extracted from the experience of past times—it is in the hands of a skilful historian to the administration and government of nations, what anatomy is in the hands of a skilful surgeon to the preservation and recovery of individual health. The nations gone by are dissected for the use of the nations in being, and those yet to come—the diseased parts are pointed out, the effects of circumstances and local habits are demonstrated, and the constitution and formation of the frame are exhibited. We learn what may, when it is necessary, or may not be lopped off without danger to the vital functions, and the mode of doing it: in the composure of the "theatre," and in the apathy of our subject, we practise experiments and gain knowledge to be laid up for use against the hurry and agitation of reality. As¹ the ancient surgeons and physicians were ignorant of important points where anatomy would have enlightened them, so the historians of antiquity, because they had read or studied few histories of the rise and fall of empires and states, are totally deficient in the "philosophy of history." It is surprising what little notice they take of

¹ Millar's Disquisitions, and Le Clerc's Hist. de Médecine.

the increase of civilization, the spread of knowledge, or the amelioration of society in general—much less, of the causes which produce them—*all* they did, was to leave a few isolated facts, of which the ingenuity of modern times has made a considerable use. The science of government and political economy, from the chimerical schemes of Plato, and the few scattered hints to be found in the politics of Aristotle, appear to have been unknown in their times. We have from some of them admirable narratives of facts in their histories, as we have exquisite copies of the human form in their sculptures. But an ingenious and eloquent writer has said, that the Grecian statues want gusto; because,¹ “the sense of perfect form occupies the whole mind, and hardly suffers it to dwell on any other feeling.” The excellence of these statues consists rather in the exquisiteness of imitation and in the perfection of the “beau idéal,” than in the expression of taste, sentiment, and feeling. Thus the excellence of the best ancient histories consists in being an almost perfect transcript of wars, battles and sieges, as they appeared to the eye without appealing to the mind. The instruction however to be derived from battles and sieges, is soon exhausted—“Thus history,” says Lord Bolingbroke, “true or false, speaks to our passions always: what pity is it that even the best should speak to our understandings so seldom!”²

H. S.

VINDICIÆ ANTIQUÆ.

No. II.—[Continued from No. XXXI. p. 22.]

BACON, of whom it has become fashionable to speak as the deliverer of Science from the trammels of antient philosophy, is said to have been entered of Trinity College Cambridge in his twelfth year. “The progress he made,” says his historian Mallet, “was rapid and uncommon, for he had run through the whole circle of the liberal arts, as they were then taught, before he was sixteen. But what is far more surprising; he began even then to

¹ The “Round Table” by Mr. Hazlitt, No. 40. Vol. 2.

² On the Study of History, l. 13.

see through the emptiness and futility of the Philosophy in vogue, and to conjecture that useful knowledge must be raised on other foundations, and built up with other materials, than had been employed through a tract of many centuries backward."—At twenty-eight, we are told "that he gave full scope to his conceptions, surveying the state of learning, observing its defects, and imagining the proper methods to supply them. This he first attempted in a treatise which he entitled *THE GREATEST BIRTH OF TIME*."—And at the age of forty-six he published his *Cogitata et Visa*, the prodromus of his *Novum Organum*; and other writings called philosophical.—"Upon the whole," says Mr. Mallet, "he was not only well acquainted with every thing that had been discovered in books before his time, and able to pronounce critically on those discoveries: he saw still farther; and at the end of his treatise de *Augmentis Scientiarum*, has marked out, in one general chart, the several tracts of Science that lay still neglected or unknown."

That the capacities of individuals to acquire information are very unequal, and that the natural powers of Bacon were very great, will readily be admitted; but that a boy of sixteen should in less than four years have made himself so completely master of the circle of liberal arts, as to entitle him to judge of the excellence, or imperfection of the philosophy then taught, cannot possibly be true: and we find evident marks in his works that his acquisitions were by no means of the high order described by his Historian. There is nothing in the writings of Lord Bacon to show that he was acquainted with the Philosophy of the Greeks, otherwise than through the medium of Latin translations; or that he had ever studied these so far as to comprehend the general principles upon which that philosophy is founded. If, educated in the Greek language, Aristotle studied under Plato and other great masters for nearly twenty five years before he undertook the task of teaching, we must suppose that youth inspired, who at sixteen has conquered all the difficulties of the language, and accurately studied a system of Logic and philosophy so difficult of acquisition.—But Bacon had to study the Latin as a foreign or rather as a dead language—the Greek Mathematics in the more extended sense—Natural philosophy—Logic—Rhetoric—and other branches of Science then making up the academical course at Cambridge; and,

if we believe his historian, he had studied all these, and saw the futility of the *Philosophy* then in vogue, and conjectured that knowledge must be built upon other foundations.—In the work already mentioned, the *Cogitata et Visa*, he finds fault with Aristotle for making use of the Syllogism in his books de Natura ;—“Atque de Syllogismo qui Aristoteli oraculi loco est, paucis sententiam claudendam, rem esse nimirum in Doctrinis quæ in opinionibus hominum positæ sunt, veluti moralibus et politicis utilem, et intellectui manum quandam auxiliarem: rerum vero naturalium subtilitati et obscuritati imparem et incompetentem. Nam Syllogismum certe ex propositionibus constare, propositiones ex verbis, verba notionum sive animi conceptuum testes et signacula esse. Quamobrem notiones ipsæ, quæ verborum animæ sunt, si vagæ, nesciæ, nec satis definitæ fuerint (quod in Naturalibus longe maxima ex parte fieri consuevit) omnia ruere.”—In this passage we see that Bacon did not know in what manner Aristotle had applied the syllogism to physics, for both he and his master Plato expressly declare that reasoning can only be convincing when confined to genus and species, but that of individuals which are infinite there can be no science, because there can be no correct definition or comparison. As far as correct Definition is to be obtained in Physics the syllogism is applicable, and when Definition is incorrect the syllogism can be of no use either in morals or politics. It is true that of tastes, colors, smells, &c. we can give no accurate definition in words, although, imperfect as language is, we may so far describe even these so as to give those who taste, see, and smell, some idea of our meaning; but in the contemplation of nature, and prosecution of every art, we unavoidably syllogize, and hold it as incontrovertibly true that like causes will produce like effects. Definitions are certainly necessary, before we argue, or come to any decision on which we may rely as true; for until those engaged in dispute know that they speak of the same thing, and use well understood common terms, no satisfactory result can be expected. Cicero says, it is possible “tribuendo in partes, latentem definiendo explicare:” and again adds, “Hæc patefactio quasi rerum operatarum cum quid quidque sit aperitur—definitio est;” and although to us the essence of things is unknown, of this we must be satisfied, that until by definition, disputants conceive one common object, all discussion must be in vain.—It is, however, a mistaken notion that

definition ought to include every particular in which the thing defined differs from others: for Aristotle confines Definition to the genus of what is defined—what it has in common with other things, and to the specific difference by which it is distinguished from other things, of like nature; for he adds, the differences of things are innumerable, because every thing is different from what it is not.

But when Lord Bacon says that definition and syllogism may very well apply to *Opinions*—but not to sensible objects, he very evidently uses words to which he had attached no distinct meaning, for *opinion* admits of no definition, being in itself nothing beyond *imperfect ideas*, which enable us to judge of probability, or improbability; whereas clear and perfect ideas amount to real science, when the mind rests satisfied in the discovery of the Truth. And here it may be observed that three Greek verbs, each frequently translated “*intelligo*,” according to the analogy of the Language and usage of the most accurate writers, ought to be very differently rendered. The first is *Νοέω*, which signifies, I revolve in my mind, I think of a certain subject, and make use of the *discursus mentis*; *διάνοια*, in order to arrive at the truth, but the process is yet incomplete. The second is *Ειδέω*, a verb not in use in the present Tense, but which retains its place in our Lexicons, and in many tenses is of frequent occurrence, and variously rendered—*scio*, *intelligo*, *animadverto*, &c.; but no one word in the Latin Language will convey its full meaning, for it merely relates to the knowledge we acquire from external form, or appearance; as the *Εἶδωλον* is the effigies or representation, as far as relates to external form, of (e. g.) a man—but is in fact essentially different. The third verb alone denotes full and perfect knowledge as far as it may be acquired by human beings, and denotes that the process is complete, that by reasoning a man has arrived at where he may stop and safely say, *Ἐπίσταμαι*—“*I know*,” and *ἐπιστήμη των ὄντων* is a comprehensive Definition of Science in general.¹ It is therefore evident that there can be no Definition or Science of things imperfectly known, or of what is infinite, and that to speak of definition as applicable

¹ The writer is aware that *νόησις*, *εἰδησις*, *ἐπιστήμη*, are used in various acceptations. He merely gives the above observations as agreeable to the analogy of the language, and to some of the best authorities.

to matters of opinion is in truth an absurdity; as it also is to say that the Syllogism is useful only where the Ideas are yet imperfect, and that connected reasoning is not useful in the investigation of the phænomena of Nature. Lord Bacon, however, sets out with the assumption that there really exists a Science of the infinitely varied forms and combinations of Matter, and that by repeated experiments on those combinations we may arrive at general laws of nature or the science of Universals. He admits that Plato was a superior man, “*altioris ingenii* ;” but he adds that whoever will attentively consider his works *must see* that he was very little solicitous about natural philosophy, and certainly Plato was not to be expected to enter into the experimental philosophy of Bacon, as we know that he held particular experiments to be the business of the artisan, and enjoined his pupils not to enter upon the study of what was in its nature infinite, and from which no general principle could be derived. Of the reasonableness of this rule we shall easily be satisfied when we consider that of all the human countenances that have appeared on earth, perhaps no two were ever exactly alike, no two blades of grass—or sands upon the sea shore; although human countenances, grass, and the sands of the sea, may be generally described with their specific differences. The various forms of sensible objects, their modifications and combinations, might occupy the human mind for ages, and without the possibility of arriving at first principles or the general Laws of Nature; for the mind would thus be employed in the pursuit of what is unattainable.—It is surprising that Bacon could bring himself to believe that in ancient times no experiments were made in Natural philosophy, with so many and striking proofs before his eyes of the excellence of their works of Art—the stupendous works which their skill in Dynamics enabled them to construct, the accuracy of their works of Science, and the taste displayed in whatever is beautiful. Yet one of his conclusions is “*quare visum est ei neque in Græcorum, neque in novorum hominum placitis, neque in Alchymix aut naturalis magix traditionibus, aliquid inveniri quod ad opes humanas majorem in modum augendas spectat. Itaque hæc omnia vel oblivioni devovenda esse, vel popularibus studiis permittenda, dum veri scientiarum filii alio cursum dirigant.*”

The exact meaning of the words “opes humanæ” is not very evident, as they are here used by Bacon. It is no doubt true, that the Greek philosophers did not teach how wealth is to be acquired :—but the greatness and splendour of antient Athens and Rome—the riches and possessions of many of the inhabitants—and the luxury which at length proved fatal to both, show that, while the Greek philosophy prevailed, the means of acquiring wealth were fully understood and more successfully practised than they have been by those who, adopting the notions of Bacon, are styled by him “veri filii scientiarum.”—That the philosophy he recommends is confined to objects of sense, appears from his censure of Plato for having mingled theology with his philosophy ; and of Aristotle, for his application of logic to the phænomena of nature. The higher philosophy, which treats of what is immutable, he designates by the barbarous word *notionalis*, which he says, is always uncertain ; yet he uses the word “notio” for idea, when he says, “notiones ipsæ verborum animæ sunt ;” and of these he admits that they may be distinct and well defined, so that it is difficult to discover what meaning he attaches to the word ; and probably this vague expression had appeared objectionable to Sir Thomas Bodley, who informed him that some of his phrases would hardly pass current in the world. His barbarous, and sometimes affectedly mystical, style forms the most complete contrast when compared with the plain didactic manner of Aristotle, whose language is never figurative or mysterious, although, from the conciseness of his expressions, they frequently stand in need of illustration. Yet we find his biographer commends his style as excellently suited to the subject ; and, what is still more extraordinary, he affirms that he introduced *a new and better sort of logic*—rejecting the syllogism as an instrument, rather hurtful than serviceable to the investigation of nature, and using, in its stead, a severe and genuine induction.

“This induction, (he says,) is not the trivial method of the schools, which, proceeding on a simple and superficial enumeration, pronounces at once from a few particulars exposed to the danger of contrary instances : but an induction that examines scrupulously the experiment in question, views it in all possible lights, rejects or excludes whatever does not necessarily belong to the subject ;

and then, and not till then, concluding from the affirmatives left. A crowd of instances might be brought to show how greatly this method of inquiry has prospered in the hands of the moderns; how fruitful it has been of discoveries, unknown and unimagined by antiquity. But I will mention one that may stand in place of many: the optics of our immortal Newton: where, in a variety of experiments, he has analysed the nature and properties of light itself, the most subtle of all bodies, with an accuracy, a precision, that could hardly have been expected in examining the grossest and most palpable: from whence, by the method of induction, he has raised the noblest theory that any age or country can show."¹ This sounds very magnificently, but examined more closely it will appear, that the writer had not thought so correctly as he ought before he pronounced so decidedly on the merits of Bacon, as a philosopher.

It has already been observed, that Lord Bacon believed the syllogism to be chiefly useful in matters of *opinion*, and that he appears to have been unacquainted with the manner in which Aristotle applies it in physics, and, in fact, did not know what the word *philosophy* was understood to signify among the antients—believing, as Mr. Harris expresses it, that truth is only to be ascertained by means of the alembic or air-pump. He speaks of his *induction* as a new mode of discovering truth—" *via vera sed intentata*," and in many parts of his writings he represents Aristotle and Plato as improperly applying logic and the syllogism to natural science, of which he makes repeated experiments the basis.² If in

¹ Life of Lord Bacon. London, 1768. duodecimo, pp. 121, 122.

² The Edinburgh Reviewers affirm, that Bacon did not *represent induction* as a new mode of discovering truth. His words "*restat sola inductio, via vera sed intentata*," incontestably prove, that he did claim the merit of having first recommended this method of acquiring knowledge. Dr. Reid, in his Analysis of Aristotle's Logic, (Edin. Edit. 1806. pp. 140, 141.) says, "After men had laboured in the search of truth near two thousand years, by the help of syllogisms, Lord Bacon proposed the method of induction, as a more effectual engine for that purpose. The art of induction, first delineated by Lord Bacon, produced numberless laboratories and observatories, in which nature has been put to the question by thousands of experiments, and forced to confess many of her secrets that before were hid from mortals."

the complete circle of science, which his biographer informs us he ran through in four years, had been included the rudiments of the language and philosophy of Greece, he would have known that induction was used by these philosophers as the foundation upon which the syllogism is reared. Aristotle expressly says, ἡ μὲν δὲ ἐπαγωγή Ἀρχή ἐστι καὶ τοῦ καθόλου· ὁ δὲ συλλογισμὸς ἐκ τοῦ καθόλου. *Moral. Lib. vi. c. 3.*

In many parts of his philosophical writings he mentions the inductive mode of reasoning as the clearest, the most convincing, being the most easily apprehended by sense, and therefore in common use. ἔστι δὲ ἡ μὲν ἐπαγωγή πιθανώτερα καὶ σαφεστέρα, καὶ κατὰ τὴν αἴσθησιν γνωριμώτερα—καὶ τοῖς πολλοῖς κοινόν. *Topica, I. c. x.*

Many passages might be cited from the writings of Aristotle and his commentators, to prove that induction was in common use among the ancient philosophers, and that there is not the least foundation for the opinion entertained that it was first pointed out by Bacon.

The decay of the Greek language, the mistranslations, and absurd comments of the schoolmen, had thrown discredit upon the writings of the Greek philosophers before the time of Bacon, and as it seems evident that what he knew of these writings was derived from bad translations, it is not surprising that he rashly condemned what he did not understand. He appears to have believed that, before his time, no efficient means of acquiring knowledge were in use; and, indeed, he tells us very plainly that he believed mankind must necessarily become wiser, as the world grows older; for, says he, “in the remoter ages of antiquity the world was in its infancy.” How would he account for the dark ages; how for

Had Dr. Reid been acquainted even with the epitome of *Diaconus*, he would have known, that by induction we form propositions, and from propositions the conclusion, which perfects the syllogism. Ὡς περὶ δὲ πάντος λόγου στοιχεῖα τὰ γράμματα, ἐκ δὲ τῶν γραμμάτων αἱ συλλαβαί, ἐκ δὲ τῶν συλλαβῶν ὁ λόγος· οὕτω πάντος συλλογισμοῦ ἀρχοῦνδίστιροι μὲν οἱ ὄροι, ἐκ δὲ τῶν ὄρων προτάσεις, ἐκ δὲ τῶν προτάσεων, τὸ συμπέρασμα. *Prolegomenon in Philosophiam.*

' De antiquitate autem, opinio quam homines de ipsa foveant, negligens omnino est et vix verbo ipsi congrua. Mundi enim senium et grandævitas, pro antiquitate vere habenda sunt: quæ temporibus nostris tribui debent, non juniore ætati mundi, qualis apud antiquos fuit. Illa enim ætas respectu

the deplorable ignorance of the Egyptians once the most learned and scientific people on earth? Are the inhabitants of Italy now more learned than in the time of Trajan? or those who inhabit the soil of antient Greece better informed than in the time of Alexander?—In this instance the reasoning is bad, for mankind are easily diverted from the laborious pursuit of true science by pretenders to new inventions, who, ignorant of what has been taught and known before their time, profess to teach how to acquire knowledge by shorter processes, and easier means, than have been formerly used. By such means the philosophy of Aristotle has seven several times fallen into disrepute, and as often regained its pristine reputation, within the last two thousand years. Lord Bacon's reasons for the preservation of the writings of Plato and Aristotle, and the long prevalence of their doctrines, must be particularly noticed for their singularity. “*Quod de cessatione antiquarum philosophiarum post Aristotelis opera edita, homines cogitant, id falsum est; diu enim postea, usque ad tempora Ciceronis et secula sequentia manserunt opera veterum philosophorum. Sed temporibus insequentibus ex inundatione Barbarorum in imperium Romanum, postquam doctrina humana velut naufragium perpressa est; tum demum philosophiæ Aristotelis et Platonis tanquam tabulæ ex materia leviori, et minus solida per fluctus temporum servatæ sunt.*” *Nov. Org.* aphor. lxxvii.—In this passage Bacon asserts, that the philosophy of Plato and Aristotle did not immediately take place of other systems then taught; that the works of the antient philosophers remained till the time of Cicero, and

nostri antiqua et major, respectu mundi ipsius nova et minor fuit. Atque revera quemadmodum majorem rerum humanarum notitiam, et maturius judicium ab homine sene expectamus, quam a juvene propter experientiam, et rerum quas vidit et audivit, et cogitavit varietatem et copiam: eodem modo et a nostra ætate (si vires suas nosset, et experiri, et intendere vellet,) majora multo quam a priscis temporibus expectari par est; utpote ætati mundi grandiore et *infinitis experimentis* et observationibus aucta et cumulata. Authores vero quod attinet, summæ pusillanimitatis est, authoribus infinita tribuere. Recte enim *veritas* temporis filia dicitur, non *authoritatis*.”

The analogical reasoning in the above quotation is utterly false, arising from the personification of the *mundus*, as if the wisdom of men must of necessity be proportioned to the age of the world they inhabit.

even the following ages. That the books of other philosophers were in existence in the time of Cicero we know, but we also know that the philosophy of Plato and Aristotle prevailed over every other system before the death of Alexander; and Cicero himself informs us, that he regards Aristotle as the first of philosophers, unless an exception were made in favor of his teacher Plato. Of Aristotle he says, that he was “*vir summo ingenio, scientiæ copia.—vir singulari ingenio et pene divino—longe omnibus, excepto Platone, præstans et ingenio et diligentia.*” In another place he says: “*Aristotele nemo doctior, nemo acutior, nemo in rebus vel inveniendis, vel judicandis acrior.*” Be it observed, that Cicero had actually read the works of Aristotle, and justly complains, with Lucretius, that the Greek philosophy could not be accurately explained in Latin, “*propter egestatem linguæ.*” But Bacon makes no complaint of that nature, but proceeds first to censure the Greek, whose works he had certainly never studied in the language in which they were written, and then to write on philosophy in a species of Latin altogether barbarous; using terms, “*which would have made Quintilian stare and gasp,*” and Cicero could not have understood, derived, as most of them are, from the English.—In the above passage the name of Cicero is mentioned in such a manner, that an inference might be drawn against the prevalence of the philosophy of Plato and Aristotle, because it is said, the writings of the antient philosophers were still extant in his time, and for some ages; but in more than fifty passages in the works of Cicero, the names of the two Greek philosophers are mentioned in terms of the highest admiration, as having far excelled all other philosophers. He mentions the works of the more antient philosophers as extant, and certainly had an opportunity of ascertaining their merits, and comparing them with those of the peripatetic school, to which he gives the most decided preference. The reason Bacon assigns for the preservation of the works of Plato and Aristotle, after human learning had, as it were, suffered shipwreck, that they were “*ex materia leviores et minus solida,*”—and, therefore, were preserved—while he insinuates that works of much greater value perished, is disingenuously urged, is contrary to the well ascertained fact, and besides manifests a strange abuse of figurative language. It is not true that the writings of these philosophers

then first came into repute (*tum demum*) when learning was nearly lost; for during the life of Aristotle himself, the peripatetic philosophy was in the highest repute, and before his death he gave over his whole library to his pupil Theophrastus, who succeeded him. Theophrastus, adding his own library to that of his master, transmitted it to Neleus, and he to his descendants *ἰδιώταις ἀνθρώποις*, who, for fear of the seizure of the books for the library of Pergamus, hid them under ground, *κατὰ γῆς ἔκρυψαν ἐν διώρυγί τινι*. In this concealment it is supposed that the works of Aristotle suffered much, and many were lost. They were afterwards sold to Appellico, and his books having been taken, upon the occupation of Athens by Sylla, they were carried to Rome, and put into the hands of Tyrannion the grammarian; and, after him, into those of Andronicus Rhodius, whose commentaries upon the *Ethica Nicomachea* are still extant.—If Bacon, then, intended to assert that the writings of Aristotle first came into repute in an illiterate age, and were preserved as being of a more trifling nature than other philosophical works, no longer understood by the people, we have the most complete proof from the testimony of Plutarch, Strabo, Galen, and a multitude of the most learned men, from Aristotle's own time, to the fifth and sixth centuries of the Christian æra, that the assertion is utterly unfounded. These works that have come down to us were studiously preserved by the most learned men for successive ages, and were ever esteemed as the most valuable works of antiquity, while the language in which they are written was understood, as the writings of the Alexandrian commentators sufficiently show. The idea that works of real merit are more readily forgotten than those of a more trifling nature, as stone will sink to the bottom of an overflowing river, while straw and rubbish float onwards, is incongruous; and we have seen that the age in which it became necessary to preserve the works of Plato and Aristotle by extraordinary means was by no means an age of ignorance, compared with those that have followed; and we may give credit to Cicero, when he assures us that the loss of other philosophical works is not to be regretted, while we preserve those of the two great masters.

The language of Bacon is barbarous in the extreme: for in writing on what he calls philosophy, he by no means takes the

trouble to adhere to the philosophical language of the Romans, but introduces words, to which he may have attached some meaning, but which are not to be found in any classical author, or any respectable dictionary. *Notio*—*notionalia*—*suitas*—*ultimitas*—*identitas*—*imaginativus*—*spontaneitas*—*limitaneus*—*virtus coitura*—*forma calidi*—these, and hundreds of other words, utterly barbarous, show that he was not qualified to write tolerable Latin, and that Addison ought to have been ashamed of the extravagant compliment he paid him, when he said, “that he had the sound, distinct, comprehensive knowledge of Aristotle, with all the beautiful lights, graces, and embellishments of Cicero.” Bacon, as far as we can judge from his writings, was ignorant both of the language and philosophy of Aristotle, for his quotations are from the Latin translations; and if Addison had intended to turn him into ridicule, he could not have done it more effectually, than by attributing to him the elegance of Ciceronian Latinity. The knowledge of what has been done and known before our times, is absolutely necessary, before we propose to extend the bounds of human knowledge, or write a book, as Lord Bacon did, “*de augmentis scientiarum*.” Cicero very justly observes, “*non nosse quæ fuerunt ante nos, id est esse semper puerum*,” and that Lord Bacon did not know what had been done in philosophy before his time, when he affected to despise writings he did not understand, as his admirers do to the present day, must be apparent to all who have studied the works of Plato and Aristotle, and at the same time have looked into his. But the fact is really singular, that while this statesman, who, as Harvey observed, “philosophized like a Lord Chancellor,” is eulogized in our universities, very few of his admirers appear to be acquainted with his writings, or with the palpable fact, that *induction* was in common use thousands of years before he was born. The writer of this sketch pointed out to a member of one of our universities, a great admirer of Bacon, the absurdities he has collected concerning *motion*, and he appeared surprised; but still, unwilling to admit that they amount to mere nonsense, resorted to the authority of Dr. Reid, who had said, he was much inclined to measure every man’s intellectual powers by his estimation of Lord Bacon. It has already been shown (No. I.) that Dr. Reid, by his own confession, knew nothing of the physics of Aris-

totle, and very little of his logic, finding both very *dry reading*; and it is more than probable that he was unacquainted with the fact, that *induction* was in use before the time of Bacon. Dr. Reid was, no doubt, a very worthy man; but somewhat narrow in his notions of philosophical investigations, for he admitted that he could not disprove the arguments of Berkely, as a philosopher, but thought himself bound to resist them as a clergyman: and, according to this rule, he may have thought it right to give a preference to the philosophical writings of Bacon over those of Aristotle, because his Lordship was a Christian, and the Stagirite a Heathen; but the most pious divine may at all times safely follow truth, which never can prove injurious to the interests of true religion. Such authority might be strengthened by the exaggerated praises of Cowley:

Bacon, like Moses, led us forth at last,
 The barren wilderness he passed:
 Did on the very border stand
 Of the blest promis'd land,
 And from the mountaiu top of his exalted wit,
 Saw it himself—and showed us it.

But Moses knew the country he was in, he had his reasons for leaving it, and he knew that a better settlement was provided for the people, and the route he had to pursue in order to reach it in safety. Bacon, without knowing the principles of the philosophy he condemned, proposed “to put nature to the torture, so that she might be brought to confess her secrets,”—and invited his countrymen to set out on a voyage of discovery in science, without any defined object. Experiments have been going on since his time, and new combinations and modifications of matter may be found for ages yet to come, but the promised land, the certainty of science, which the poet assures us he saw, and pointed out to others, we have not yet attained.

Pope also contributed to raise a false character for Bacon, by designating him “the greatest, wisest, meanest, of mankind,” for none of these epithets are applicable to his character. With his writings and history before us we may reasonably conclude, that he was a man of good natural parts, but no considerable learning; that his education was held to be completed when it ought to have been beginning, and that he proposed the publication of

his "Greatest Birth of Time," when he ought to have been making himself acquainted with what time had already produced.—With that obliquity of intellect which considers fraud as something that may prove ultimately advantageous, he is certainly not entitled to the appellation of *wisest of mankind*, and it is to be feared that corrupt judges will not leave to him the distinction of being the *meanest*. In like manner Pope considered Newton as the greatest philosopher that ever appeared; and his celebrated distich is repeated at the present day :

Nature, and Nature's laws, lay hid in night :
God said, let Newton be, and all was light.

In these lines there is something of absurd impiety; but they have contributed, for nearly a century, to keep up the idea that the geometrical and astronomical rules and calculations of Sir Isaac Newton form the very basis of true natural philosophy; and it is only of late that men of science begin to be sensible that his authority is not infallible. The calculations of Sir Isaac are admitted to be correct; and he was a man of excellent character, having no intention to deceive, and really believing what he gave to the world as true: but although his conclusions be well founded, it by no means follows that his premises must be correct, for many natural appearances are equally well accounted for upon very different hypotheses.—This subject, however, will be resumed at another opportunity.

To return to the philosophy of Bacon. When we ask, what has Lord Bacon done to entitle him to consideration as a philosopher? the answer is, he introduced the *inductive* method of reasoning from experiments. What is *inductive* reasoning? It is proceeding from one ascertained truth to others, not at first evident, and this, it is supposed, mankind were not in the habit of doing until the time of Bacon. It has already been shown, that induction was in common use many ages ago; and without reasoning by induction, we can neither obtain a knowledge of the material world, nor form rules for the regulation of the ordinary affairs of life. "When we observe, that a proposition, affirming or denying any quality of a particular material thing, to be true of a great number of particulars of the same species of things, we infer that it is true of all; and we infer that it is not only so at present, but

will continue to be so in time to come, and has been so in time past." It is also in this manner that we reason concerning the affairs of men; for by observing that men placed in certain circumstances often act in the same manner, we assume it as a fact predicable of the whole species, that men placed in similar circumstances will act similarly. Without the use of inductive reasoning it is altogether impossible that men can derive advantage from experience, or that society can exist on any stable foundation. Every artisan uses inductive reasoning in the exercise of his art, and *moral evidence* is formed from a long continued observation of the actions of men, and the strong presumption that like motives will produce like actions. Induction enables us to form general ideas from particular instances, and this mode of reasoning we unconsciously use even in our childhood: a particular flame has burned the hand, or a false step has occasioned a severe fall from a height; and the conclusion is immediately formed, that all fires and precipices are dangerous and ought to be avoided. We find many of the inferior animals acting as if they reasoned in this manner, for if they did not, it would be natural for them to follow, on all occasions, the instinct of their nature, but this they will not do when danger is suspected.

*Cautus enim metuit foream lupo, accipiterque
Suspectos laqueos, et opertum miluius hamum.*

Anglers are well acquainted with the fact, that after they have seen and killed one fish, no other will rise, or take the bait in the same spot for some time, unless such as may have accidentally arrived, after the former fish was killed; and even vermin, as rats, act with the greatest caution, and will rather suffer from want of food, than take it where they suspect danger. In short, it is by induction that we acquire the rudiments of knowledge; and it is astonishing that at a period when the dark ages were no more, men could be persuaded that it was invented by Lord Bacon. But although it is by induction that we acquire general ideas, a farther process is necessary to enable us to form general conclusions. Galen, a most eminent philosopher and physician, (whatever may be said by those who have never read his works,) says that the syllogism is that progressive reasoning, which, certain things being

ascertained, a farther conclusion necessarily follows, at first unknown. Συλλογισμός ἐστὶ λόγος, ἐν ᾧ τίθενται τινῶν, ἕτερόν τι τῶν τίθεντων, κατ' ἀνάγκην συνάγεται, πρότερον ἀγνοούμενον. Here the matters ascertained, or, as we say, *given*, are ascertained by induction, and the syllogism is used as the means of more readily arriving at a general conclusion.

That the syllogism is the foundation of all geometrical knowledge is certain, for every proposition consists of a series of syllogisms terminating in a conclusion which we cannot conceive to be false, or, if we reason *ad absurdum*, in that which cannot possibly be true. In experimental philosophy it is more difficult to ascertain premises exactly; but in as far as that can be done, the syllogism is applicable and highly useful. "Some," says the learned Wolfius, "perhaps may wonder why I should cry up so much the usual syllogistic method, as a thing at this day in the greatest disrepute with every one. Let such know, that I am neither a blind admirer of antiquity, nor yet altogether unacquainted with modern discoveries: that my teachers, indeed, inspired me with contempt for the syllogistic manner; and that I, like others, have in my ignorance laughed at syllogism I own; but, upon maturer reflection, I found the matter otherwise than is generally thought; and now, out of love to truth, I scruple not with others, who are great men, openly to avow that, which is now exploded, from ignorance and simplicity, by those who never examined the matter with sufficient penetration.—I will show, by examples, that geometrical demonstrations are resolvable into formal syllogisms—that nothing is discovered in mathematics but by means of such syllogisms, and that in the other disciplines, we can never come to demonstrations but by the syllogistic method, for by it we obviate every error, even of the most subtle nature." He adds, that the whole of the algebraical calculus, by means of which so many discoveries are at this day made in the mathematics, and their kindred sciences, is performed by pure formal syllogisms; and adds, that in experimental philosophy such syllogisms lead to complete demonstration, and of this he gives several examples.—See *Logic*, or rational thoughts on the powers of the human understanding, by Baron Wolfius. London, 1770, p. 74, et sequent.

We have here the authority of a truly learned man,—that is, learned

in mathematics and natural philosophy,¹—in direct opposition to that of Lord Bacon, who gives us his *cogitata et visa*, which may be truly rendered, his *conjectures* and *conclusions* formed from these conjectures, as a basis upon which true science is to rest.—When Wolfius wrote, the writings of Bacon were generally known on the continent, several editions having been published in Latin, in various forms, but in his Treatise on Logic, he makes no mention of them, nor was it to be expected that he should—believing, as he did, that mathematics are indebted to ontology for their certainty; and that the first philosophy, in dignity and certainty, is that which Bacon calls *notionalis et incerta*.

The philosophy which the antients admired—and which Wolfius, who died not much more than half a century ago, held to be the foundation of all human knowledge, Bacon rejects for the very reason they assign for giving it a decided preference, viz. because it is *general and abstract*. “*Axiomata infima* (says he) *non multum a nuda experientia discrepant. Suprema vero illa, et generalissima (quæ habentur) notionalia sunt, et abstracta, et nil habent solidi. At media sunt axiomata illa vera, et solida, et viva, in quibus humanæ res et fortunæ sitæ sunt, et supra hæc quoque tandem ipsa alia generalissima, talia scilicet quæ non abstracta sint, sed per hæc media vere limitantur.*” Here we have a very convincing proof, that Bacon believed objects of sense, and the Proteus-like ever-changing forms of matter, to be the true subject of philosophy; while, on the other hand, the philosophers of antiquity deemed fleeting and perishable material forms, scarcely fit to be considered as subjects of science. Philosophy, says Andronicus Rhodius, must necessarily afford the greatest pleasure, on account of its purity, and because its subject is abstract, imperishable, and ever the same: φαίνεται τοίνυν ἡ φιλοσοφία θαυμαστάς ἔχουσα ἡδονάς, διὰ τε τὴν καθαριότητα καὶ τὸ ὕλης ἀπὸ πλῆθους ἀπὸ ἀπληγμένη καθάπαξ εἶναι, καὶ διὰ τὸ βέβαιον, ὅτι περὶ τὰ ἀκίνητα, καὶ ὡσαύτως ἔχοντα ἐέργει. He adds, that practical

¹ When Voltaire was at Halle during the earlier part of the reign of the Great Frederic, the students presented their *album*, or memorial book, entreating that he would write something in it, which he did as follows:

Wolfio philosophante, rege philosopho regnante, et Germania plaudente, Athenas Hallenses invisi. VOLTAIRE.

science, the object of which is mere matter, must afford less satisfaction to the mind, because it is liable to infinite contingencies.

It has been already observed that the writings of Bacon came abroad at a time when Greek literature was on the decline, when the philosophy of Aristotle was taught in barbarous Latin, and so disfigured by gross mistranslation, as to leave no trace of the correctness and beauty of the original. Had it been otherwise, had Aristotle's precepts been delivered in his own language, and studied so as to be understood, it is impossible that the doctrines of Bacon could have been well received by men of education; and far less would they have been countenanced in our universities. The public would have seen at once the absurdity of listening to one, who at sixteen ventured to condemn what he could not possibly understand; for to acquire a competent knowledge of the Greek language and Grecian philosophy, years of diligent study are necessary when the follies and trifling pursuits of youth are over. But several causes concurred to give a certain *fashion* to the works of Bacon. He was a most servile flatterer, and pretended to appeal to the authority of the wretched pedant *James*, as to an infallible oracle. By this means he ensured his approbation; and as the king pretended to sit as umpire during philosophical discussions at the universities, then, perhaps, even more servile than when that of Oxford expelled Mr. Locke upon the mandate of his grandson, the royal approbation could not fail to have a powerful effect in recommending the new philosophy, as it was called, of the Lord Chancellor. It was given out, that this new philosophy would do away the difficulties and tedious march of study; that the idea of the antients, that every thing really estimable is to be acquired with difficulty—*χαλεπὰ τὰ καλὰ*—was founded in error, and that any man of genius, by trying experiments, might arrive at results far more important and useful than the wisdom of ages had yet discovered.

It was a saying of James,—“Let me have the appointment of judges and bishops, and that shall be law and gospel which I please;” and it really appears, from the state of the universities at the time, that he could also mould philosophy according to his own fancy. After students had once heard, *ex cathedra*, that ancient philosophy, and ancient literature, were no longer deemed

necessary to the education of a learned man, and that Lord Bacon had discovered the only real path to knowledge by a happy sagacity, which had detected the fallacies and sophisms of antiquity, we can easily anticipate the ulterior progress of the new philosophy. Not one student of a thousand has strength of mind enough, if his information justified the attempt, to call in question the authority of his preceptor—the antient philosophy, together with the language in which only it can be taught, were neglected—all was considered as visionary that could not be felt and seen—and Dynamics, Geometry, and Astronomy, began to be considered as the whole of philosophy. The establishment of a Royal society, which confined its discussions to these subjects, and numerous periodical publications, in all of which the inductive method, in experimental philosophy, was represented as a highly important discovery, contributed to establish the reputation of Bacon, of whom the great majority expressed themselves in terms of high admiration, while very few took the trouble to examine his works with attention. Recently the exaggerated praises of this writer have almost come up to the fulsome panegyrics of Cowley and Pope. We have been told, that “no man ever united a more *poetical* style to a less poetical philosophy; and that one great end of his discipline is to prevent mysticism and fanaticism from obstructing the pursuit of truth.” As to his style, it is affectedly mystical, but not one spark of the poet’s fire is to be discovered from end to end of his works. Take the following lines, a version of part of the 104th psalm, as a specimen of his poetical style. The subject is, the great deep.

The fishes there far *voyages* do make,
 To divers shores their *journey* they do take;
 There hast thou set the great Leviathan,
 That makes the seas seeth like a boiling pan.

A writer in the Edinburgh Encyclopædia says of his style, after noticing that his distinctions are often perplexed or indefinite, particularly with regard to physical and metaphysical science; that “his language also is destitute of precision, being extravagantly metaphorical, and also replete with unnatural conceits and obscure allusions. It is much more reprehensible than Aristotle’s, which he has blamed for abounding in new words. His censure of the more eminent philosophers is expressed in the most acrimonious

strain of scurrility. He was too ambitious of innovation, and too fond of paradox. In violation of his own rules, he often assumed facts without sufficiently scrutinizing the evidence on which they rested, and sometimes without any examination at all, and very frequently, in his attempts to account for facts, he negligently acquiesced in hypothetical principles, which had obtained a popular currency." This writer appears to be the first who has ventured fairly to characterize the writings of Bacon, while the Gentlemen of the Edinburgh school so extravagantly be-praise them, that they even admire his *idola, specus, tribus, fori, and theatri*—and find his mystical jargon dignified and significant. This part of the book so astonished poor King James, that he exclaimed, "that buik is just like the peace of God, which passeth all understanding." The writer above-mentioned, after some very just criticisms on the writings of Bacon, adds, "that it must be allowed he had the merit of having bequeathed to the world a larger and more precious mass of *sound logical* instructions, deduced from his own reflections, than are to be found in the writings of all the authors who preceded him." It will be no easy task to reconcile the foregoing strictures with this conclusion; nor to point out any thing in the writings of Bacon that deserves the title of *logical instruction*, which he indeed affects to despise.

Of all the systems of philosophy that have prevailed at different periods, it may be truly said, that by their fruits we shall know them. If, after trials for a century and a half to find out truth, and establish general principles by particular experiments, we must admit that we have failed, and can produce nothing in literature or science to bear comparison with the models of antiquity, we may rest assured that we pursue a wrong path in the pursuit of knowledge, and must recur to first principles, if we would escape that age of darkness which Sir Thomas Bodley predicted would be the consequence of the adoption of Bacon's suggestions.

Many obstacles, however, present themselves to the revival of ancient philosophy, and of these the long-continued study necessary to understand the language is none of the least. If we would restore the ancient discipline, the period of study must be much enlarged; and in place of completing a course of education at *sixteen*, a young man of good parts may at that age be able to enter

upon the study of philosophy, provided he has had the advantage of good instruction, and has acquired a general knowledge of the language, so that he may prosecute his studies successfully.

But those who agree with Bacon, that philosophy is not to be prized unless it tends to encrease the wealth and resources of mankind, will not easily be brought to see the excellence of that, which has for its object the discovery of truth, and the acquisition of knowledge; more especially as the pursuit is attended with difficulty, and the language of Hesiod concerning virtue may well be applied to true science;

Τῆς δ' ἀρετῆς ἰδρῶτα---Θεοὶ προπάροιθεν ἔθηκαν
 Ἀθάνατοι, μακρὸς δὲ καὶ ὄρθιος οἶμος ἐπ' αὐτὴν
 Καὶ τρηχὺς τὸ πρῶτον ἐπὴν δ' εἰς ἄκρον ἵκηται,
 Ῥηϊδίη δ' ἤπειτα πέλει, χαλεπή περ εὐῦσα.¹

Another obstacle to the revival of philosophy, is the unwillingness with which men are brought to admit that they have been in error, and to admit that the precepts of their youth are to be abandoned in their old age.² By some of our professors such a recantation would be made with great reluctance; for having boasted of their ignorance of the antient philosophy for many years, and assured their pupils that it does not deserve to be studied, it would prove a most mortifying task, to make a palinode, and admit the error. However, these teachers will probably finish their course, undisturbed by the consciousness of having been mis-

¹ The above lines from Hesiod lead us to inquire into the exact import of the word Ἀρετὴ, *virtue*, which is used in various senses. Some lexicographers, deriving it from Ἄρης, Mars, render it *heroic valour*, and it is no doubt often used in that sense. But it would seem that it is sometimes used as denoting science, or knowledge, as in the above lines, and in the following beautiful ode of Aristotle,

Ἀρετὰ πολὺμοχθε
 Γένει βροτείῳ
 Θήραμα κάλλιστον βίῳ
 Σᾶς περὶ παρθένε μορφῆς
 Καὶ Ξανεῖν ζηλωτὸς Ἑλλάδι πότμος,
 Καὶ πόνοὺς τλήναι μαλεροῦς
 Ἀκάμαντας. τοῖον
 Ἐπὶ φρένα βάλλεις
 Καρπὸν φέρεις τ' ἀθάνατον. α. τ. λ.

² *Quæ imberbes didicere, senes perdenda fateri.*

led themselves, and the means of misleading others; but the hope is to be indulged, that the rising generation may be brought to see the degraded state to which science is reduced, and to contribute their endeavours to the revival of true philosophy. Of one thing they may rest assured, that no person capable of reading and comprehending the works of the antient philosophers ever hesitated in giving them a decided preference to the productions of modern times, but, as Bishop Berkeley observes, *many an empty head is shaken at Plato and Aristotle, that never comprehended their doctrines*; and none so flippantly condemn their writings, as those who can neither read nor understand them.

COLLATIO

CODICIS HARLEIANI 5674.

CUM ODYSSEA EDITIONIS ERNESTINÆ 1760.

No. VIII.—(Continued from No. XXXI. p. 122.)

ΟΔΥΣΣ. Φ.

5. προσεβήσето.
7. χρυσίην et χαλκείαν suprascr.
11. κείτο.
16. δετιλόχοιο.
17. ἐπὶ χρεῖος in marg.
19. νομῆες et ας super ες.
26. ἤρακλειᾶ.
29. τὴν οἱ scripserat, deinde ἤν superaddidit inter voces.
32. ῥ' omittit. In fine versus παιδὶ.
42. δὴ omittit.
43. προσεβήσето et σ super σ secundum.
46. κορώνης.
52. εἴματ' ἐκείτο.
58. ἴμεν ες.
61. τῇ ῥ' αἶμα'. Deinde ὀγκίον et supra finem vocis υς. Videntur

duæ fuisse lectiones, ὀγκίον et ὄγκους.

66. omittit.

73. φαίνεται ἄεθλον a manu prima et sic pro var. lect. in marg. In textu nunc φαίνεται ἰσθλὸν ex emendat. sed manus antiquæ, fortasse eiusdem, quæ variam lectionem adscripsit.

83. ἄλλος.

84. ἐνένιπεν et hic et infra 167. 287. x. 212.

86. δειλῶ.

98. γίεσθαι, sed σ inter ὕ et ε suprascr.

100. ἐν μεγάραις.

103. μὲν μοι.

109. omittit. Quare abesse non posse dicat Ernestus, non video.

111. μηδέ τι.

113. πειρήσομαι γρ. πειρησαίμην.

123. εὐποσμος et supra γρ. εὐκόσ-
μους.

125. πολέμιζεν, sed ε super ο et
ξ supra ζ.

126. τῷδε.

128. nullam varietatem video
neque in MSS. neque in editis.
Scholiastes vero ad Iliad. B. 215.
in Codice Townleiano hæc habet :
Εἴσαιτο: εὐκτικὸν ἀντὶ ἑριστικοῦ τοῦ
ἔδοκει, ὡς τὸ καὶ νύ κεν ἐνθ' ἀπόλοιτο
ἀρης. [Π. Ε. 388.] καὶ νύ κεν δὴ τανύσει
βίη τὸ τέταρτον ἀνέλκων. Est et aliud
exemplum ejusdem constructionis
Iliad. E. 311. καὶ νύ κεν ἐνθ' ἀπόλοιτο
ἀναξ ἀϊδρεῖν αἰνείας.

133. ἀπαμύνησθαι.

135. τῶζον πειρήσεσθε.

145. ὁ σφι.

156. προτιδέγμενοι.

162. γήμεθ'.

173. αἶστοῦ, sed ὦν super οῦ.

174. τανύουσι.

180. ἐκτελέωμεν.

181. ὡς φάτο· αἶψα δ' ἀνέκαie.

186. δέ τ'.

187. ἀρχή.

188. ἀμαρτήσαντες et ὁ super α in
initio.

192. μιν ἔπεισι.

196. ἐνείκαι text. γρ. ἐνείκη.

197. ἀμύνουτ' et η super οι.

202. ἔσονται·

208. ἤλυθον εἰκοστῶ, sed e huic
voci præfixum, quasi aliam vellet
innuere lectionem, ἤλθον ἐεικοστῶ.

211. γρ. ἀπώτροπον.

215. ἐμοῖο.

220. παρ νησὸν δ'.

223. ὀδυσηΐ δαΐφρονη.

231. ἐγών.

234. σὺ δή.

235. δὴ pro τε.

236. 241. κληίσσαι.

237. κτύπον et ου super ον.

248. εἶπε πρὸς ὃν μεγαλήτορα θυμόν.

251. 252. αἰ μεν—αἰ δ'.

274. γρ. προσέφη

276. omittit.

288. οὐ δὲ βιαί text. γρ. οὐδ'
ἡβαιαί.

289. ὅ.

294. πῖνοι.

296. ἄσ' ἐνὶ μ.

302. ὀχέων a manu pr. ἀχέων ex
emend.

304. οἱ δ'.

305. ἔδητύος ex emend.

315. ἥφι πειθήσας.

329. ἡμῖν δ' ἄν.

333. πάντα, sed suprascr. γρ.
ταῦτα.

335. πατὴρ δ'.

339. εἴματα πάντα, sed in marg.
γρ. καλὰ.

342. κειεύοι.

346. 347. οὐθ' ὅσοι.

347. νήσσοισι γρ. οὐθ' ὅσοι ναίουσι.

352. τῶζον post rasuram, sed, ut
puto, ab eadem manu. Fuerat
μῦθος, quod scriba meminerat ex
A. 358.

365. ἡμῖν θ'.

366. αὐτῇ ἐνὶ χώρῃ.

397. ἐπίπλοκος text. γρ. ἐπίκλο-
πος.

410. πειρήσετο.

425. ἡμβρετεν.

434. παρθερόν ἐστήκει.

ΟΔΥΣΣ. X.

22. δάμαθ'.

25. οὐδέ πω.

28. ἀντιάσας.

37. 38. transponit.

40. ἔσσεθαι.

43. omittit.

52. βασιλεύοι.

57. depravatam quidem vide-
tur, sed non notatu indignum,
quod habet Etymologus M. p.
758, 47. τιμὴν ἀλφίσκοντες et deinde
ἐκάττου.

82. βάλε δέ.

84. περιερεθῆς et suprascr. περι-
κλινῆς.

88. ἐτίνασσε. Deinde κ' ἔχυντ'.

98. τύφη. text. γρ. ἡ τύψει.
Habet etiam προπερηῖ, sed a su-
per i.

102. πάγχαλκον.

110. ἔνθα, sed εν super α. Mox
ἔλετο.

113. δύσετο.

130. ἔστειλ' a manu prima.

131. ἀγέλεως μετέειπεν.

143. ἀναρρῶγας.

157. δὴ pro δι'.

166. ἐνόπες et sic disertè citat
hunc locum Etymologus M. p.
343, 7.

167. αἱ καὶ κρείσσων τε.

175. πείρηναντε.

177. πάσχει.

179. βῆ δ'.

184. πεπαλαγμένον et suprascr.
μέμολυτμένον.

192. πείρηναντε.

200. ὑπὸ δεσμῶ.

201. τ' omittit.

209. ὀμηλική.

216. κτέωμεν.

231. σὸν τε.

247. τοῖσιν δ' ἀγέλεως μετέειπεν.

251. ἐφίετε.

255. ἐκέλευεν.

270. μνηστῆρες δ' ἄρ' ἐχώρησαν.

271. τοὶ δ'.

275. βεβλήκειν a manu prima.

278. ἄκρον.

280. τὸ δ' et ν suprascr.

287. πολυθρῆσιδῃ.

297. φθισόμεβροτον.

307. τοὶ et suprascr. γε. τούς.

322. μου pro που.

323. ἐμοῦ.

330. ἀλύσκανε. Et sic citat
Apollonius in voce.

336. ἔκειαν.

364. ὑπὸ pro ἀπὸ. Deinde βοδς,
sed suprascr. γε. θαῶς et in marg.
περισσὸν τὸ βοδς.

370. μεγάρω.

372. ἐρύσατο.

373. γνῶς erat, sed nunc s era-
sum.

401. καταμένοισι νέκυσιν.

429. ἔχενεν.

441. ἐξαφῆλσθε.

456. ἐκφύριον.

458. δμαῶς δ'.

462. ἐν pro δῆ.

469. τὸδ'.

489. ἔσταθ' et in marg. ἴστασο.

492. περίφρων εὐρύκλεια.

495. ἀπέβη.

501. γίνωσκε δὲ φρεσί.

ΟΔΥΣΣ. ♣.

1. ἀνεβήσετο.

16. παρῆξερέουσα.

20. ἔρχεν.

21. τις μοι.

22. μ' omittit.

35. ἐνόσπες.

40. πειθόμεν ac deinde ἄκουσα.

45. καταμένοισι νέκυσιν.

46. ἔστειλ'.

47. et 49. notantur ᾱ et γ̄.

48. additus in marg. β̄.

49. γῦν δ'.

51. κηάμενος ex emend.

53. γε. ἀμφοτέρων.

63. κτεῖναι.

66. εἰσαφίκηται.

77. πολυκερδίησι.

86. ἐξερεῖναι, sed οι super ω.

89. ἐναντίη.

94. ἐνωπαδίας. In marg. ἔνιοι
ἦίσκιν' ἀντὶ τοῦ ὁμοίου [ἀμοίου] τῇ
ὄψει τοῦ ὀδυσειῶς.

95. ἀγνώστισε.

96. ἐνέμπεν.

102. ἔτεϊ φίλην ἐς.

114. φράσσεται sine καί.

125. φᾶσθ'.

127. 128. omittit manus pri-
ma, sed additi sunt ex recensione.
Si igitur, Th. Benteio auctore,
codices quosdam hoc distichon
omittere ait Clarkius, id non us-
quequaque verum est.

131. πρᾶτον.

132. δμαῶς δ'.

134. πολυπαίγμονες.

136. στοίχαν.

142. πρῶτα μὲν ἄρ'.

146. περιστεναχίζετο.

147. πεζόντων.

163. ἐκ ῥ' ἀσαμίνθου.

168. οὐ μὲν κ' ἄλλη γ'.

169. ἀποσταίη, sed non supra

101.

172. σιδῆρεον ἐν φρεσὶν ἦτορ.

174. 175. οὐτ' ἀθερίζω οὐτε.

179. ἐκθεΐσαι a manu prima.

Mox ἰμβάλετ'.

187. οὐ κέν τις.

192. δέμον.

193. πυκνήσιν λιθάκεσσι.

201. ἴφι κταμένοιο text. γρ. φοίνικι φαεινῷ.

204. ἀπό.

207. κίεν.

222. τὴν δὴ τοι.

225. ἀριφραδέα et suprascript. ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀριφραδῶς.

226. ἦν pro τήν.

231. τῷ δ' ἄρα.

251. μαντεύσατο et suprascr. μυνήσατο.

266. θυμῷ κεχαρίσται.

270. ἀνερεις.

276. καὶ τότε δὴ et postea ἐκέλευσεν.

283. ἀπό.

296. Scripsit antiqua manus, sed quæ paucas admodum notas margini addidit, τοῦτο τὸ τέλος τῆς ὀδυσεύας φησὶν ἀρίσταρχος καὶ ἀριστοφάνης.

298. πόδας omittit.

301. ἐνέποντε a manu prima.

311. ἤλθες (sic) Manifesta, sed levissima corruptela. Legendum enim ἤλθ' ἐς Α. In vulgata lectione inconcinne positum ὡς, multo commodius ἀπὸ κοινοῦ supplementum.

322. ἡδ' ὡς εἰς αἶδω recte MS. Vide supra ad Α. 631.

357. τοῦ.

348. φέροι.

354. ἀμφοτέροι, sed in schol. marg. ἀμφοτέρω, ut textus supra 351.

358. ἐναύλους.

359. ἄπειμι.

361. ταῖδ', non τιδ'.

ΟΔΥΣΣ. Ω.

4. ἐβέλη et versum addit; τὴν μετὰ χερσὶν ἔχων, πέτετο κρατὺς ἀργειφόντης.

39. σοῖο.

41. οὐκίτι.

45. ἀμφί.

46. κείραντο.

49. ἐπὶ δὲ τρέμος.

53. ὁ σφιν.

56. τεθηγότος.

57. ἔσχοντο, sed ἱ super ἱ.

61. ἐνόησας a manu prima. ἐνόησα ex emend. valde recenti.

65. πολλὰ δ' ἐπ' αὐτῷ.

72. δὴ τοι a manu prima.

75. περικλυτὸν suprascr. pro varia lect.

90. θήσαο.

96. ἱμήσατο.

103. παῖδα φίλον μελανῆος ἀγεκλυτόν.

107. ἄλλως.

121. habet, sed pro 122. duo sequentes: μέμνημαι τάδε πάντα διετρεφῆς ὡς ἀγορεύεις· σοὶ δ' ἐγὼ εὖ μάλα πάντα καὶ ἀτρεκέως καταλέξω. Ad ultimam vocem in marg. γρ. ἀγορεύσω.

123. κακὸν μέρος οἶον [οἶος].

132. μεταμάνια et sic scholia diserte.

142. omittit.

160. ἐνίσσομεν.

180. τιτυσκόμενος et ἀγχεστήνοι.

199. στυγερὴ δέ τ'.

200. χαλεπὴν δ' ἐνὶ φῆμιν ἐπάσσει.

203. ἔσπεῳτ'.

213. δόμον εἶσω.

216. 217. transponit.

222. νύων.

253. Schol. ἔοικε τῷ κατὰ σὲ γεγηρακότεν εὐδόμεναι μαλακῶς, ut videatur legisse ἔοικεν.

256. τῷ bis.

269. αὐτῶν.

275. 276. Pro his duobus versibus unum dat MS. δῶδεκα δ' ἀπλοῖδας χλαίνας τότσους δὲ χιτῶνας.

277. ἀμύμονα.
 280. ἦν ἱξερεῖνεις.
 293. περιφρων pro var. lect.
 Idem mendum supra Π. 130.
 294. ἐν λεχέσσιν εἰς et in fine ver-
 sus ἐπιώκει.
 302. πάντα pro ταῦτα.
 316. ἀδινά.
 345. ἀναγνόντος et suprascr. ἐπι-
 γνόντος
 351. ἀτάσθαλον.
 352. διδοικα ex emend.
 357. ἴν' ὀρχάτου text. γρ. δς ὀρχά-
 του.
 369. ἐκ ρ'.
 381. ἐγήθεις.
 389. ἔμαρψεν.
 397. ὀδυσεύς et suprascr. ὀδυ-
 σείας.
 400. videtur primo scriptum δς
 σ' ἀνήγαγον.
 401. μέγα, sed suprascr. μάλα.
 410. σφόν. a manu prima.
 417. ἑκαστος.
 425. ὄγ' ἐμήσατ' ἀχαιούς.
 439. ἀνῆκεν. et suprascr. ἀφῆκεν.
 444. θεῶν et ο super ὦ. Mox
 ὀδυσεύς et σ aliud super σ prius.
 448. ἀγχηστῆγοι.
 452. ὅ σφιν.
 457. ἔριξαν.
 484. θομεν.
 496. ὀδυσῆα ἐξ δ' υἱεῖς οἱ δ.
 497. ἔδυνον et αν super εν.
 500. ᾧξαν ῥά (sic).
 527. τ' omittit.
 540. δὴ τότε.

NOTICE OF

*HIEROGLYPHICORUM ORIGO ET NATU-
 RA: Prolusio in Curia Cantabrigiensi (in Comitibus,
 quod aiunt, Maximis,) III. Kal. Jul. MDCCCXVI. reci-
 tata, cum Primum tulisset præmiorum, quæ ab Academiæ
 Legatis dari solent quotannis Senioribus, sic nuncupatis,
 Artium Baccalaureis. Conscripsit JACOBUS BAI-
 LEY, B. A. Coll. Trin. Schol. Cantabrigiæ, Typis ac
 Sumtibus Academicis excudit &c. Veneunt apud Long-
 man & Soc. &c. [Pr. 3s. 6d.]*

AMONG the various prizes instituted at Cambridge for the advancement of classical learning, are four (perhaps, the most important, so far as relates to *original composition*) of Fifteen Guineas each, given annually by the Representatives of the University in Parliament to two Bachelors of Arts of the second, and two of the third year's standing, for the best Dissertations in Latin prose, on subjects proposed by the Vice-chancellor and Heads of Colleges, somewhat (usually) within two months of the

day of decision. The successful candidates are distinguished by the appellation of *Members' Prizemen*,—and are denominated *middle* or *senior* Bachelors, accordingly as they belong to the second or third year of their Bachelorship. It were to be wished that the period allowed for composing were longer; as, if the subject be extended over much ground, he who would hope for success cannot for that time think with propriety of giving his attention to any thing else. This is a point deserving of consideration: a candidate for these prizes being, generally, at the time of writing, not many months removed from a Fellowship-examination. If the period were doubled, the hours cut off from the ordinary occupations of the day might, of themselves, be nearly sufficient for these exercises; and the student be not so immediately compelled *partem solido demere de die*. As it is, he enters the lists for a Fellowship with a manifest disadvantage; and *might*, upon this account only, have to give way to an inferior man.

In some cases, where the merits of the competitors have warranted such a measure, a *third* prize has been awarded, of the like value with the others. This may, of course, happen either in the *middle*, or (as it did in the present instance) in the *senior* year. But one example has occurred, in which the same individual has been first of three in both years. The student was of St. John's College.

The subject of the Dissertation before us, which our readers will remember to have seen registered in a former page of our work, is *The Origin and Nature of Hieroglyphics*; and is, of all others, one which furnishes an ample scope for investigation, as may be imagined from this simple truth: that, after all the discussions that have been brought forward from time to time upon it, by the literary of almost every European nation, so much as a single character (with the acute ingenuity of Warburton, and the extensive erudition of Zoega, a name but too little known in this country, to back the attempt) has not been deciphered with certainty upon any one of the numerous hieroglyphical monuments that remain. Even the monument of Rosetta furnishes no exception to this assertion, it being a doubt with literary men, [see the Edinburgh Review] whether the hieroglyphics engraved on it are the representatives of *things*; or of *sounds* the exponents of *things*; in plainer terms, whether the key to this inscription be, or be not, what may be termed an *hieroglyphical alphabet*,—of a kind with that Egyptian one, in which Plutarch informs us that the figure of the *Ibis* represented the letter *A*, or with the Hermetic alphabet in *Hammer's Hieroglyphics*.

This is, we believe, the first subject that was ever proposed to candidates for the Members' Prizes purely of a critical kind; it has been usual to confine these Essays to subjects moral or

political, or to such as are connected with the more elegant and ornamental parts of ancient and modern literature. It was proposed by Doctor Kaye, Master of Christ-College and Regius Professor of Divinity. The example, as was to be expected, has been followed; and the very next year the subject given to the senior Bachelors was of the same class.

As it is entirely without the compass of a publication like ours to give a minute and particular account of a work like the present, we shall content ourselves with scanning over its surface hastily, and, as we scan, with noting a portion of the framework for inspection, cursorily and in the rough. All we can do, and all indeed that it is the province of a Literary Notice to do, is to give our readers a general notion of the work that we have in hand. They who would have more, must go to the book itself.

Praise, like the precious metals, is only valuable where it is bestowed with proper limitations: and unqualified approbation is as the dust we tread upon. The best compliment that we can pay to the author of the Dissertation on Hieroglyphics, is to tell the literary world at large, what was told to the University, to which he belongs,—*that the said Dissertation was rewarded with the first prize of three,—that, at the unanimous request and with the consent of the examiners (the Vice-Chancellor and Heads of Colleges), an impression of five hundred copies was printed at the University press free of expense, and presented to the author,—and that this distinction was never before conferred upon any successful candidate.* This is a mere matter-of-fact statement: and this the most invidious man living cannot withdraw.

The book has no preface; and perhaps needed none. The title and dedication seem fully to supply the want of this. Of the dedication, which is very properly addressed to the examiners, it may be said with truth, that it is short without being defective, and respectful without being fulsome.

It is well known that, previously to the time of Warburton, it had become a received opinion, that the hieroglyphic characters of the Egyptians were so many secret marks, instituted by their priests, to secure their doctrines from the prying eyes of the curious. This opinion had derived so much validity from the huge volumes of the Jesuit Kircher, added to the fact, that the priesthood did in after-times employ these characters in that way, that nothing short, it should seem, of the penetrative sagacity of Warburton could have discovered the cheat. It was necessary to state this as a preliminary: and accordingly, in order that the main body of the Essay might not be burthened with the detail, our author has, not injudiciously, prefixed to the Dissertation an Introductory Epistle; in which the old notion that hieroglyphics are generally connected with mystery is exploded, and the trea-

tise thus made to start clear, with Warburton's admirable discovery, that this is but the second stage of writing, in the fore-ground.

From Warburton therefore as a basis, added to the more elaborate researches of Zoega, this Dissertation, as it professes, must be allowed to have sprung. The learning and research of the latter writer, of whom Denmark has reason to be proud, are indeed such as, in a manner, to have sifted the subject,—so far, that is to say, as relates to the testimony of antiquity. And upon that, and that only, what we are to know of hieroglyphics must depend. The display of materials, which, from a life wholly devoted to the study, he has been able to amass, is enough almost to stagger belief: and of this very rich fund, “pressed down,” as it is, “and running over,” our author, as was to be expected, has not scrupled to avail himself at pleasure.

The opening pages of the Dissertation are occupied with a clear and sufficiently full account of the first stage of writing, which was by actual representation of the thing signified; and that not in the order, and after the arrangement, of what is usually termed *written language*, but clusteringly and by the group. This has been called *Picture-writing*. Specimens are recorded in the Dissertation as having been found in all the four quarters of the globe. Egypt, by reason of the superior genius of its inhabitants, was the first to make any material advance on the road to improvement; and accordingly, finding that in *spoken language* the ideas of man are connected, as it were, in a chain, they straightway set about framing a *written language* upon the same principle; which could only be effected by making every figure represent a distinct idea. The representations would then admit of continuity just as much as the ideas themselves. Thus, in the famous inscription mentioned by Plutarch as standing over the arch-way of Minerva's temple at Sais, the sentence QUI NASCERIS, QUIQUE INTERIS, DEUS ODIT IMPIETATEM, was expressed by the figures of *An Infant, An Old Man, A Hawk, A Fish, and A River-Horse*, taken in order; the ideas of *Being born, Dying, God, Hatred, and Impiety*, being, by agreement, severally denoted by those figures. Again; in the inscription on Sethon's statue (Herod. 11. § 141.) the sentence ΕΣ ΕΜΕ ΤΙΣ ΟΡΕΩΝ, ΕΤΣΕΒΗΣ ΕΣΤΩ, might possibly have been expressed by *A Figure of Sethon pointing to himself, An Eye, and A Stork*; the three signifying respectively the ideas of *Sethon, Sight, and Duty*. This is *Hieroglyphical writing*. Picture-writing is, where a person should send an account to his chief of a victory gained, by an actual representation of the field of battle, the enemy flying, victors pursuing, &c. or of the extent of an enemy's fleet, by depicting the number of vessels; and the like.

But our limits compel us to be brief: and we shall have room

to extract no more from the main body of the Dissertation, than what will suffice to present our readers with a sketch of the FOUR kinds of hieroglyphical characters (and this seems to be the most correct enumeration), as deduced from the celebrated passage in Clemens Alexandrinus, Strom. v. 2. p. 657. Potter's Edition.

1. The first is called *the cyriologic*, or *proper*, hieroglyphic; and is where the idea to be expressed is of something visible and capable of being represented picturally, and, for that reason, so represented. Of this kind are the figures of *The Infant*, and *The Old Man*, in the Saitic inscription. Here is no symbol; a symbol being the representation of one thing by the figure of another, or by a figure that is not its own exclusively.

2. The three remaining kinds are *symbolic*. The first of these is called *the proper symbolic* hieroglyphic, and differs from *the proper*, or *cyriologic*, hieroglyphic, only in this; that the representation does indeed copy, or sketch out, the form of the thing to be expressed, as far as it admits of being copied, or sketched out; but cannot, in the nature of the form imitated, succeed in producing a perfect or exclusive imitation. Thus the Egyptians, when they would express the idea of *The Sun*, drew the figure of *A Circle*; of *The Moon*, *A Crescent*: where it is plain that the expression is incorrect; *the circle* being as correct a representation of *The Full Moon* as of *The Sun*, and *The Crescent* no representation at all of *The Moon when Full*. So far as these marks profess to imitate, they are *cyriologic*, or *proper*: as they fall short of perfect and exclusive imitation, they are *symbolic*. Figures of this nature are therefore denominated by Clemens *cyriologic symbolic hieroglyphics*.

3. The next of the symbolic hieroglyphics is *the tropic*: and hieroglyphics of this nature are the most common. Thus *Fire* was represented by *Smoke*; *The field of battle* by *Two Hands, one equipped with a shield, the other with a bow*; *Agriculture* by an *Ox*: where the figures of speech (as they are termed) or *tropes*, respectively employed, are, Metonymy, Synecdoche, and Metaphor.

4. The remaining symbolic hieroglyphic is called *the enigmatic*; and is distinguishable from *the tropic* hieroglyphic only in this; that the allusions are more implicated, and the tropes, by consequence, less obvious. Thus, *The Sun* was represented by *a Beetle*; *The number five*, by *a Star*; *The Month* by *a Serpent*; and so on.

N.B. The difference between *the cyriologic*, *the tropic*, and *the enigmatic* hieroglyphic, may be seen at once, and in the same figure, in a passage from that curious relic of antiquity by Horapollo. He there informs us, that the figure of *Isis*, when written *cyriologically*, meant *The Goddess herself*; *tropically*, *The Dog-star*, because sacred to *Isis*; *enigmatically*, *The Year*.

Of the notes, which are, perhaps, the most valuable part of the Dissertation, and most undoubtedly so with respect to the future developement of hieroglyphical writing, we have not room to say what we wish. Those, however, in p. 52. and 64. cannot be passed over. From the sum of these we learn, that our author has *proved* the obelisk, epitomized in Græek by Hermapion (see Amm. Marc. xvii. 4.) to be, not the Lateran, as Sir John Marsham was of opinion, but the Flaminian. This proof obtained, he has been able to compare the hieroglyphics and the Greek with effect. The result of which is, that *he has actually succeeded in deciphering a sequence of not less than five hieroglyphic notes.* The value of this discovery will be the more apparent, when we place before the eyes of our readers the following considerations :

1. That, although the works that have been written on the subject are of themselves enough to form a considerable library, this is the first example that has occurred since the days of antiquity of a sequence of hieroglyphic notes deciphered.

2. That, by identifying the Flaminian obelisk with the one used by Hermapion, and deciphering a part of it in consequence of that identification, more is to be expected from that obelisk than from the Rosetta stone; the Greek inscription upon that stone being evidently not a translation of the hieroglyphics, as appears from the repetition of a sequence of not less than forty hieroglyphic notes, first discovered by our author (see p. 72. note); no corresponding repetition being found in the Greek.

3. That the discovery, added to what is stated in p. 42. note 2. places the authenticity of Horapollon beyond dispute; which is of the greater import, as by the learned he has but too frequently been thought of no authority.

4. That, as Ammianus Marcellinus is right in his account of *The Bee* as an hieroglyphic, his authority (and not on matters relating to Egypt merely) will for the future be better worth taking.

5. That the interpretation in question is precisely in unison with the interpretation of the Saitic inscription as recorded by Plutarch.

6. That what Warburton took as the first principle on which to rest his theory, viz. that hieroglyphics are but the second stage of writing, is *proved* to be correct by this very discovery.

7. That from the same source it may be deduced, that Father Kircher's enormous folios are but a tissue of outrageous falsehood from one end to the other.

8. That Zoega's conjecture that the elliptic devices on the obelisks are proper names, derives *proof* from the said discovery.

9. That Warburton's *supposition*, that the intent of the obelisks was to record the military praises of the Egyptian kings, is *confirmed* by the said discovery, very nearly without exception; similar elliptic devices occurring in a similar manner in all the obelisks, and all of them therefore denoting the names of kings.

10. That, in order to express the names of *different* kings, *different* hieroglyphic marks are observed to be contained within the oval rings on *different* obelisks.

11. That, from this last consideration, it seems probable, that the Monticælian, the Medicean, and the Mahutæan obelisks, (which have a more modern appearance, and are the same with respect to the elliptic devices, and in other respects as well, with the Flaminian) are mere transcripts of that obelisk, made in after-times; and that the same is true *a fortiori* of the Sallustian obelisk, the lithography of which is known to have been cut at Rome.

12. That from this very observable variation of the marks within the elliptic rings upon the different obelisks, added to the great difficulty of comprehending how proper names could be written after the common fashion of hieroglyphics, and backed by a remarkable passage in Horapollon, which at this present we cannot quote otherwise than from memory,—ἐν μεσῷ τῷ εἰλίγματι ὄνομα γράφουσι,—from which, not improbably, Zoega's discovery, mentioned in article 8. was drawn out, it seems not unlikely that the clue to the developement of these proper names is an *hieroglyphic alphabet*.

13. That, if this be true, the present discovery paves the way to such developement.

14. That the method of coming at such developement, must be by comparing the component parts of the name *Rhamestes* and that which stood for *The Sun*, with the component parts of that of *Ptolemy* and others upon the Rosetta stone; it being as certain that the radical parts of the names must be the same in the Egyptian and in the Greek, as that the *formative* should be different. The proper name of *The Sun* may have been read Osiris. See Macrob. Saturnal. I. 21.

15. Finally, that the proof relating to the identification of the Flaminian obelisk in p. 52. note 1. and the interpretation of a portion of that obelisk in p. 64. note 1. corroborate each other reciprocally.

As the discovery, therefore, is of so much importance, we can hardly do justice to our author without giving it as expressed in his own words; which may serve also, once for all, as a specimen of the style and manner in which the Dissertation is written.

“Quod ad Schemata illa elliptica attinet, quæ in obeliscis fere omnibus interdum simplicia, interdum etiam occurrunt bina, posterioris hujus generis notandum est septendecim in obelisco Flaminio omnino reperiri; in latere scilicet australi quatuor, quod et in boreali contigit, necnon etiam in occidentali; quinque autem in orientali. Quorum omnium, si unum alterumve errorem excipias ab hieroglypta profectum, (exemplum sit circuli omissio in meridionali latere obelisci,) eadem omnino, ut videtur, ratio est. Pro nominibus propriis, hieroglyphice expressis, sumenda esse hæc schemata mecum putaveram, ante lectam nuper Anonymi de tabula Rosettana epistolam. Vide *Mus. Crit. Tom. 11. p. 202.* Cf. etiam Zoeg. p. 465. Ceterum hanc meam conjecturam duo vel præsertim firmare videntur. Unum

quidem, quod nusquam ovatæ in obeliscis figuræ conjugatæ reperiuntur, nisi avis cujusdam ope *δολιχοδείρου*; quem, etiamsi illic loci nulla de circulo supra avis caput plerumque suspenso facta sit mentio, Horapollinis tamen vulpanserem esse quovis pignore contendam, eundemque *filium* significare. Locum exscribam; Ὑὼν δὲ βουλέμενοι γράψαι χηναλώπεκα ζωγραφοῦσι. τοῦτο γὰρ τὸ ζῶον φιλοτεκνώτατον ὑπάρχει. κὰν γὰρ διώκηται ποτε εἰς τὸ συλληφθῆναι σὺν τοῖς τέκνοις, ὅτε πατήρ καὶ ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ αὐθαιρέτως διδύσασιν ἑαυτοὺς τοῖς κυνηγοῖς, ὅπως τὰ τέκνα διασωθῇ· δι' ἣν περ αἰτίαν τοῖς Αἰγυπτίοις ἔδοξε σεβάζειν τὸ ζῶον. I. 53. Alterum est, quod super harum superiore ovatarum figurarum apīs fere semper designatur cum palmite, vel flosculo, vel, si malis, sceptro, binis suffulta hemicyclis. Quam cum Ammiano Marcellino (xvii. 4.) pro *Rege* accipiendam esse mecum habeo persuasissimum. Verba ejus sunt; “Per speciem apīs mella conficientis indicant Regem; moderatori cum jucunditate aculeos quoque innasci debere his signis ostendentes.” Ceterum et hoc vidit auctor Anonymus supradictus; a quo, ut videtur, horum studiorum amantes per multa, nec injuria, sperabunt. Vide *Mus. Crit. Tom. 11. p. 203.* Nec vero impedimento illud erit, quod de ape aliter constituit Horapoll. i. 62. Quæ enim pro *Populo Regi morem gerente* apīs interdum ponebatur, eadem alias, vel facilius, de *ipso Rege* intelligi potuit. Fatendum est hanc apīs figuram, quam Kircherus papilionem dracontomorphum cum thyrso papyraceo junceove, sive muscam Ægyptiacam, nuncupat (Œd. Ægypt. tom. 111. p. 183. 195. 196. 206.), alii autem formicam alatham, ab apībūs nostratibus aliquantum discrepare. Verum, quoniam in obeliscis præter scarabæum unum tantum reperitur animal ex insectorum aligerorum classe, hoc illud putarim esse, cui apīs vocabulum interpretes indidere. Ceterum rem extra dubium ponit obeliscus Sallustianus; in quo apes, quæ occurrunt, formam induere usitatiorē curavit Romanus lapicida. De apībūs consulas Aristot. *Hist. An. V. 22. ix. 40.* Ælian. de *An. 1. 59. 60. V. 10. 11.* Plin. *Nat. Hist. xi. 5. 17. &c.* Senec. de *Clement. 1. 19.* Virg. *Georg. iv.*

“Quibus quidem positis, cumque Hermapionis interpretatione collatis, geminas illas sic constitutas jugatasque figuras, in hoc obelisco, regis Rhamestis laudes concinente, sic fere Græce exponendas judico; ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣ ΠΑΜΕΣΤΗΣ, ΗΛΙΟΥ ΠΑΙΣ. Eadem quoque schemata invenies inter notas minusculas circa stylobatam capitellumque exaratas. In cujusque lateris capitello ad finem orationis prostant ab ore dei (Apollinis videlicet, quod supra observatum est, sive Ori, teste Herod. II. 144.) prodeuntis. Ultima omnium nota globus ille est duobus basiliscis, sive uræis, ornatus, additis interdum binis alīs vulturinis. Quam, dnm Horapollinem intueor (I. 1.), idem valere puto ac Græcum *αἰωνόβιος*. Exinde uniuscujusque orationis, sic dictæ, crediderim has voces finem constituere; ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣ ΠΑΜΕΣΤΗΣ, ΗΛΙΟΥ ΠΑΙΣ ΑἰΩΝΟΒΙΟΣ.”

We had almost omitted to observe that to the Dissertation is subjoined an Appendix; comprising what are considered as the only translations of hieroglyphic monuments that are known to exist.

These are, the Greek epitome of the Flaminian obelisk by Hermapion, and the Greek inscription on the Rosetta stone. Notes and Latin versions are added; and we have reason to believe that these two monuments of antiquity are no where to be found in so correct a state as in the present volume. In the first paragraph of Hermapion, Zoega, in his improved edition, had omitted the words *ΗΑΙΟΤ ΠΑΙΣ*; which are found in every other copy. If this omission had been overlooked, and Zoega's text been taken as a standard, the discovery we have stated might never have been made. The use of the supplemental parts of the Greek inscription, by Porson, together with Heyne's Latin translation, was afforded to Mr. Bailey by the Society of Antiquaries of London; whose liberality on this occasion he thus acknowledges: "*Hujusce inscriptionis, sic expletæ, usum mihi humanissime concessit Soc. Antiquar. Londinensis. Idem dictum puta de Latina, quæ adjecta est, interpretatione a Chr. G. Heyne, Profess. Sodal. Honor. Gotting. expressa.*"

SOME OBSERVATIONS

On the Worship of Vesta, and the Holy Fire, in Ancient Rome: with an account of the Vestal Virgins.

BY G. H. NOEHDEN, LL. D.

PART II. [Continued from No. XXIX. p. 130.]

It does not appear that there was any difference of degree, or pre-eminence, among the Vestals, except that which might arise from seniority. One of them, indeed, is termed *Virgo Maxima*; (see Sueton. Jul. 83. Domit. 8. Valer. Max. 1. 1. 7. Plin. Ep. iv., note of Gronovius ad Tacit. Ann. iii. 69., and other passages); but *Maxima* means no more than the eldest, or senior. Ovid calls her *natu maxima*. Fast. iv. 639.

Ignem cremat vitulos, quæ natu maxima Virgo;

And Tacitus uses the expression, *Vetustissima*, which merely relates to age, or seniority. Annal. xi. 33.: *Vibidium Virginum Vestalium vetustissimam oravit Pontificis Maximi aures adire, clementiam expetere*. It seems, however, that upon the *Maxima*, or senior, certain functions were imposed, which, in some manner, distinguished her above the others. Dio Cassius designates her station by the term *προσβεβειν*, that is, to be in the situation of senior, and to discharge the duties belonging to it. The passage to which I allude, is lib. LIV. p. 754. lin. 90. ed. Reimar. He is speaking of a fire that broke out at Rome, (in the time of

Augustus, a. U. C. 740.), and reached the temple of Vesta : καὶ τὸ πῦρ —πρὸς τὸ Ἑστιαῖον ἀφίκετο, ὥστε καὶ τὰ ἱερὰ ἔς τε τὸ Παλάτιον ὑπὸ τῶν ἄλλων ἀειπαρθένων (ἡ γὰρ πρεσβεύουσα αὐτῶν ἐτετύφλωτο) ἀνακομισθῆναι, καὶ ἐς τὴν τοῦ ἱερέως τοῦ Διὸς οἰκίαν τεθῆναι,—*the fire reached the temple of Vesta, so that the sacred relics were carried to the Palatium by the other holy virgins (their senior being blind), and deposited in the house of the priest of Jupiter.* We are to infer that, if the senior virgin had not been disabled by blindness, it would have been exclusively her business to carry those sacred articles. In this view, she may be said to have been at the head of the establishment : but we do not read that she had any control or authority over the others. In another passage (lib. LXXIX. p. 1358. lin. 91. ed. Reimar.) Dio speaks of one of the Vestals under the denomination of ἀρχιερεία, which undoubtedly was the *Maxima*, thus distinguished from the rest of them.

From the inviolability and sanctity which were attributed to the Vestals, they were frequently made the depositaries of valuable objects, such as important records, last wills, and the like. Their abode was regarded as a place of sanctity and perfect security ; and every thing, in the hands of such keepers, must not only be safe, but also exempt from the curiosity and inquisitiveness of the world. The testament of Julius Cæsar had been committed by him to the care of the first Vestal, *Virgo Vestalis Maxima* ; see Sueton. Jul. 83. The will of Mark Antony was entrusted to the Vestals ; and when Octavius Cæsar required them to deliver it up, they refused to do so. This is related by Plutarch (Anton. 58.): Τίτιος δὲ καὶ Πλάγκος, Ἀντωνίου φίλοι, τῶν ὑπατικῶν, ὑπὸ Κλεοπάτρας προπηλακιζόμενοι (πλείστα γὰρ ἡναντιώθησαν αὐτῇ περὶ τοῦ συστρατεύειν) ἀποδράντες ῥέχοντο πρὸς Καίσαρα, καὶ περὶ τῶν Ἀντωνίου διαθηκῶν ἐγίνοντο μηνυταί, τὰ γεγραμμένα συνειδότες ἀπέκειντο δ' αὐταὶ παρὰ ταῖς Ἑστύαισι παρθένοις, καὶ Καίσαρος αἰτοῦντος, οὐκ ἔδωκαν· εἰ δὲ βούλοιο λαμβάνειν, ἐλθεῖν αὐτὸν ἐκέλευον· ἔλαβεν οὖν ἐλθὼν.—*Titius and Plancus, friends of Antony, and men of consular rank, finding themselves ill treated by Cleopatra, because they had opposed her scheme of accompanying Antony in his campaign, deserted to Caesar, and informed him of the testament of Antony, as they knew its contents. The will was deposited with the Vestal Virgins ; and when Caesar demanded it from them, they would not give it up, saying, if he wanted it, he must come and take it. He, therefore, did so, and took it.* The will of Augustus was likewise deposited in that sanctuary ; see Tacit. Ann. i. 8. Sueton. Aug. 101. Other records were occasionally kept there. Dio Cassius, for example, mentions, that the treaty concluded between the Triumvirs (Octavius, Antony, and Lepidus), and Sextus Pompeius (the son of Cn. Pompeius), in the year of Rome 715, was lodged with the Vestals ; lib. XLVIII. p. 534. ed. Reimar. : Ταῦτα μὲν οὖν συνθέμενοι καὶ συγγραψάμενοι, τὰ γραμματεῖα ταῖς ἱερείαις ταῖς ἀειπαρθένοις παρακατέθεντο,—*having come to this conclusion, and drawn up a compact, they laid up the record of it with the Virgin Priestesses.* This treaty is again spoken of p. 562. lin. 32., where

Sextus Pompeius had violated it : Octavius then took it away from the Vestals, and destroyed it. Ὁ οὖν Καῖσαρ μαθὼν τοῦτο, τὰ τε γράμματα τὰ τῆς συμβάσεως ἀνέλετο παρὰ τῶν ἀειπαρθένων. Appian mentions the same treaty, and its being kept by the Vestals. Bell. Civ. v. 73. (ed. Schweighauser.): Ἐς ταῦτα συνέβησαν, καὶ ταῦτα συνεγράψαντο, καὶ ἐσημνήσαντο, καὶ ταῖς ἱεραῖς παρθένοις φυλάσσειν ἐπεμψαν,—upon these articles they came to an agreement, reduced them to writing, and signed and sealed them, and sent them to Rome to the holy Virgins to take care of. In another place, Dio notices an arrangement made between Octavius and Mark Antony, which was also consigned to the Vestals. Lib. XLVIII. p. 534. lin. 26. ed. Reimar.: Καὶ ταῦτα ἐς δέλτους γράψαντες, καὶ κατασημνήμενοι ταῖς ἀειπαρθένοις φυλάττειν ἔδωκαν.

What has thus far been observed, marks the respect and veneration with which the Vestals were regarded, and the authority and influence which they had with the people. The honours and privileges which they enjoyed, raised their station to a high degree of dignity; and it could not have failed to be an object of ambition and rivalry among those who were qualified to attain it, if those advantages had not been thought to be equalled or surpassed by the severity and rigour with which the violation or neglect of their duty was punished. This is another view of the picture to which we now must turn our eyes. Their life was by no means a life of austerity and privation; but it required the scrupulous observance of some leading points which were enjoined. Else they seem to have lived in ease and splendour; and they were not excluded from the intercourse of their friends, and the amusements of society. Every one had access to their mansion; it was only forbidden that, at night, any male should remain there. Dionys. Halic. ii. 67. ed. Reiske.: ἔνθα δὲ ἡμέρας μὲν οὐδεὶς ἀπείργεται τῶν βουλευμένων εἰσέραι νύκτωρ δὲ οὐδενὶ τῶν ἀρρέων ἐναυλίσασθαι θέμις,—no one is in the day-time prevented from entering their abode; but in the night no male is allowed to remain there. They were themselves not restrained in their going out and coming in, only that in their whole demeanour strict propriety and decorum were to be observed. In a passage, quoted before from Dio Cassius (lib. XLVII. p. 504. lin. 54. ed. Reimar.), allusion is made to a Vestal, coming home from a banquet or dinner (ἀπὸ δείπνου); and Macrobius (Saturn. ii. 9. p. 392. ed. Zeune) gives an account of an entertainment, at which four Vestals, who are mentioned by name, were present. This was, indeed, a sort of sacerdotal banquet, given by a priest of Mars (*flamen Martis*); but we have no reason to suppose that they would have been restricted from attending it, if it had been the entertainment of any other individual, provided nothing occurred inconsistent with their holy character. Decency and propriety were required in their dress and outward appearance. Of the manner in which they were usually attired, some idea may be formed from the representations that are formed on coins and medals, and afforded by some statues. See, for instance, Montfaucon's *Antiquité Expliquée*, vol. i. part i. book ii. chap. 6. p. 60. and vol. ii. p. i. b. i. ch.

S. p. 30. also Supplement, vol. 1. p. 66. Their dress was matron-like, and consisted of a long robe (*stola*, Plin. Ep. iv. 11.), and a veil covering the head, together with the *infula*, or bandeau or fillet, the *vitta*, or bandelets (which seem to have been a sort of appendage to the *infula*), and other emblems of priesthood, (στέμματα καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ παράσημα τῆς ἱερωσύνης. Dionys. Hal. 11. 67. ed. Reiske). One of their garments is particularised by the name of *carbasus* (Valer. Max. 1. 1. 7.), in Greek, ἐσθῆς καρπασίνη (Dionys. Hal. 11. 68. ed. Reiske), and seems to have been a sort of fine vest, thrown over the other dress. Pighius, in a note to Valerius Maximus, (1. 1. 7. Tom. 1. p. 16. ed. Torrent. Leid. 1726.) observes: *Nonius docet carbasum esse pallium e serico vel tenui lino, quo fœminæ divites amictantur*. It is, of course, to be presumed, that they were arrayed somewhat differently, when they were actually discharging some of their sacred functions, from the manner in which they were commonly habited. For example, when they were sacrificing, they wore a sort of square cloth, which covered the head from behind, and hung down the back. It was white, with a purple edge; and fastened by means of a clasp or buckle, whence it was denominated *suffibulum*. Festus, under this word, (lib. xvii. p. 543. ed. Delphin. 1700.), describes it in this manner: *Suffibulum est vestimentum album, prætextum, quadrangulum, oblongum, quod in capite Virgines Vestales, cùm sacrificant, habere solent; idque fibulâ comprehenditur*. The figures of Vestals, which are seen upon coins and medals, and the statues which exist represent them, almost without any exception, with short hair. It seems, therefore, as if it had been required of them to cut their hair, and wear it in a simple and unadorned manner. The cutting of the hair is established by a passage in Pliny (N. H. xvi. 85. Tom. 111. p. 142. ed. Bip.), where a certain ancient tree, at Rome, is spoken of, on which the Vestals were in the habit of suspending their hair. The tree, which was a *lotos*, was thence called *capillata*. The words are these: *Antiquior illa (lotos) est, sed incerta ejus ætas, quæ capillata dicitur, quoniam Vestalium Virginum capillus ad eam deferretur*. The devoting or offering up of the hair was, in some instances, regarded as a religious act; and probably the hanging it up on that tree, in the case of the Vestals, had a similar meaning, by which they might figuratively signify, that they had devoted themselves to the service of the goddess. We are not informed by any other passage in the ancient writers, as far as I know, whether this rite of carrying the hair to the ancient *lotos* tree was, at different times, or frequently, repeated by the Vestals, or whether it was only once performed, immediately after their reception and consecration. The people appear to have beheld with jealousy and disapprobation any departure from the venerable *costume*. Seneca (Excerpt. Controv. vi. 8.), speaking in defence of a certain Vestal, alleges as an argument in her favour, *Non illi cultus luxuriosior*; and Livy, on the other hand, (iv. 44.), mentions one, by the name of Postumia, who, by a disregard of that decorum, was not only censured for levity in her demeanour, but incurred the suspicion of unchastity, and was tried for her life: *Eodem*

anno Postumia, Virgo Vestalis, de incestu causam dixit, crimine innoxia; ob suspicionem propter cultum amœniorem ingeniumque liberius, quàm Virginem decet, parum abhorrens famam. Ampliatam, deinde absolutam, pro collegii sententiâ, Pontifex Maximus abstinere jocis, colique sanctè potiùs, quàm scitè, jussit. “In the same year” (it was the year 336 of Rome, or 417 before Christ) “Postumia, a Vestal Virgin, was tried for incontinence, though innocent of the crime; she had given a handle for that imputation by her mode of dress, which was more gay, and her manners, which were less reserved, than became a Vestal. Sentence was stayed, and she was subsequently acquitted; but the Pontifex Maximus, in conformity with the resolution of the *collegium* of pontiffs, admonished her to abstain from levity of conduct, and in her attire more to attend to gravity and propriety than to elegance.” Another instance of the same kind occurs Liv. viii. 15.: *C. Sulpicio Longo, P. Ælio Pato, consulibus—Eo anno Minucia Vestalis, suspecta primò propter mundiorem justo cultum, insimulata deinde apud pontifices ab indice servo; cùm decreto eorum jussa esset sacris abstinere,—*“in that year” (417 of Rome, 336 before Christ,) “the Vestal Minucia, having incurred suspicion on account of her dress, which was too fine and gay, and being subsequently informed against, before the pontiffs, by a slave who betrayed her, she was first of all by a pontifical decree suspended from her sacred functions,”—and she afterwards paid the forfeit of her indiscretion with her life. The jealousy which was entertained of the virtue of the Vestals, may sometimes have proved fatal to an individual that was really innocent. This was thought to be the case with one, called Cornelia, whom the Emperor Domitian ordered to be buried alive: of which further mention will be made hereafter.

From the two passages of Livy last quoted, viz. iv. 44., and viii. 15., it is seen, that the Vestals were placed under the authority and jurisdiction of the Pontifex Maximus, and the Collegium Pontificum, collectively. And it is expressly said by Dionys. Halic. (ii. 67. ed. Reiske), ἐξετασται τε καὶ κολασται κατὰ νόμον εἰσιν οἱ ἱεροφάνται,—*they are under the jurisdiction of the pontiffs*. Even when the power and dignity of the Pontifex Maximus were vested in the Emperors, as it was since the time of Augustus (Sueton. Aug. 31.), the other pontiffs sat with them in council and judgment. Thus Pliny (Ep. iv. 11.) says of the tyrant Domitian when he was going to condemn Cornelia, *reliquos pontifices convocavit*. The authority of the pontiffs over the Vestals generally, is intimated by Gellius (i. 12.) in this passage: *Virgo autem Vestalis simul est capta, atque in atrium Vestæ deducta, et pontificibus tradita*.

The two great delinquencies, for which the Vestals underwent severe punishment, were the neglect and extinction of the holy fire, and the violation of their chastity. The first was, comparatively, a minor offence when measured with the latter, at least as far as the consequences to the individual are considered; though it sometimes implicated her in the second, or heavier charge, because it was inferred, that the fire had gone out, on account of the impurity of the

priestess, who had to watch it. This we learn from Dionys. Hal. in two passages, viz. II. 67. ed. Reiske: *πολλὰ μὲν οὖν καὶ ἄλλα δοκεῖ μὲνύματα τῆς οὐχ ὁσίως ὑπηρετοῦσας τοῖς ἱεροῖς, μάλιστα δὲ ἡ σβέσις τοῦ πυρός*,—*there seem to be several different proofs that the Vestal did not discharge her functions in purity, but the chief one is the extinction of the fire.* And II. 68., he relates that the Vestal Æmilia was in danger of perishing, under the presumed charge of unchastity, because the holy fire was gone out, through the neglect of a young Vestal to whom Æmilia had delegated the care of watching over it. She was preserved from the fatal consequences with which she was threatened, by a sort of miracle. Compare Valer. Max. I. 1. 7. It was, however, not always, that so alarming an inference was drawn from the extinction of the holy fire; much probably depended upon the state of the times, when such an accident happened. If it was a period of national misfortune and calamity, then woe to the unhappy Vestal, whom that mischance of having suffered the fire to be extinguished befel. She was certain to become the atoning victim for the affliction of the people, and by her death to satiate the irritated prejudices. In ordinary times the natural and obvious cause of a similar accident seems to have been more readily admitted. It usually happened in the night, when the guardian who was to watch was overcome with sleep: it was neglect and inattention which naturally caused such an accident, and no miraculous influence, whatever superstition might make of it. This is very sensibly remarked by Livy (XXVIII. 11.): *Terruit animos hominum ignis in æde Vestæ extinctus.—Id quanquam, nihil portendentibus Deis, ceterum negligentia humanâ acciderat, tamen &c.* But if the Vestal, for this fault, was not brought into danger of her life, by means of the supposed crime of unchastity, she did not escape a severe punishment. This consisted in bodily castigation: she was scourged, or beaten with rods. Liv. XXVIII. 11.—*Ignis in æde Vestæ extinctus; cæsaque flagro est Vestalis cujus custodia noctis ejus fuerat.* Festus under the word *Ignis* (Lib. x. p. 178. ed. Delphin. 1700.): *Ignis Vestæ si quando interstinctus esset, Virgines verberibus afficiebantur a Pontifice.* Valer. Max. I. 1. 6.: *P. Licinio pontifici maximo Virgo Vestalis, quia quâdam nocte parùm diligens æterni ignis custos fuisset, digna visa est, quæ flagro admoneretur.* The expression of Valerius Max., *flagro admonere*, for *flagro cedere*, or *verberibus afficere*, has an affected appearance, and I am inclined to prefer the emendation which is suggested by some commentators (see the edition of Torrentius), viz. *flagro admoneretur.* *Flagro admonere*, for to chastise, to scourge, would not be an unusual phrase. This mode of punishment, to which the Vestals were subject, is mentioned by Dionys. Hal. (II. 67. ed. Reiske), *τὰς μὲν ἄλλο τι τῶν ἐλαττόνων ἀμαρτανούσας ῥάβδοις μαστιγούσας*,—*those who commit any of the minor offences they scourge with rods.* And by Plutarch (Num. 10.): *Κόλασις δὲ τῶν μὲν ἄλλων ἀμαρτημάτων πληγαὶ ταῖς παρθένοις*,—*the punishment of the Vestals for any other transgression but the violation of their chastity, consists*

in stripes or lashes ; which, it seems, the supreme Pontiff inflicted with his own hand : for Plutarch adds, τοῦ μεγίστου Ποντίφικος κολάζοντος,—the Pontifex Maximus administering the discipline. That the task might be transferred by him to some other pontiff is obvious, and borne out by the passage in Dionysius just quoted, where the word μαστιγοῦντες, in the plural number, assigns that duty to the pontiffs collectively ; and by Livy (xxviii. 11.), who says, “ Cæsaque flagro est Vestalis—jussu P. Licinii Pontificis,”—she was scourged by “ order of the Pontifex Maximus,” therefore, not by his own hand. That P. Licinius, though here simply denominated pontifex, was Pontifex Maximus, we know from Valer. Max. (i. 1. 6.) That chastisement was severe: for it was sometimes applied to the naked body—ἔστιν ὅτε καὶ γυμνῇν, (Plut. Num. 10.), in which case care was taken that no offence was given to decency. For the execution took place in a dark corner, and behind a curtain : so at least I believe the words of Plutarch are to be interpreted, ὁθόνης ἐν παλινσκίῳ παρατεινομένης. Dionysius Halic. and Valerius Maximus have a legend of a poor Vestal, who had suffered the holy fire to go out, but was saved from the fearful consequences of her neglect, by the immediate interposition of the goddess. See Dionys. Hal. ii. 68. Reiske. Valer. Max. i. 1. 7.

But dreadful was the punishment of her who was convicted of having violated her chastity. It was death, and the most horrid death that can be conceived (οἰκτιστος μ῁ρος, Dionys. Hal. ii. 68.) : the unhappy offender was buried alive. The crime was called *incestus*, *crimen incestus*, *incestum*, *scelus incesti*, *crimen incesti*, *stuprum*, *crimen stupri*, *probrum*. See Liv. iv. 44. viii. 15. xxi. 57. Plin. Ep. iv. 11. Festus v. *Probrum*. The criminal was denominated *incesta* (Plin. Ep. iv. 11.) The Pontifex Maximus, together with the other pontiffs, were the judges (see above). The sentence, if she was found guilty, was, to be buried alive, *viva defodi* (Liv. Sueton. Plin.) ; ζῶσα κατορύττεσθαι (Dionys. Hal. Plutarch.) The spot, where this dreadful judgment was executed, was near the *Porta Collina* of Rome, within the walls of the city. That gate was on the north-east side, and led up to the *Collis Quirinalis* and *Fimimalis*, whence it seems to have derived the name of *Collina*. It was also called *Porta Quirinalis* and *Agonensis*, and subsequently likewise *Porta Salaria*, from its being upon one of the great public roads, the *Via Salaria*. (See the writers on ancient Rome ; for example, Marlianus, Fabricius, Donatus, in Grævii Thesaur. Antiqg. Rom. Tom. iii.) It is to be noticed, that the spot alluded to was *within the town*, as is particularly remarked by the ancient writers—ἐντὸς τοῦ τείχους, Dionys. Hal. (ii. 67. viii. 89. ed. Reiske) ; ἐντὸς τῆς πόλεως, Plutarch. (Num. 10.) It seems that the Vestals, as holy persons, were generally buried within the town, not, as others, without the walls : and this distinction was even maintained with such of them as were buried alive, for the most heinous offence. There is a passage from a speech of *M. Cato de Auguribus* preserved in Festus, under the word *Probrum* (Lib. xiv. p. 375. ed. Delphin.), which confirms this : Adjicit

quoque (M. Cato): *Virgines Vestales, sacerdotio exauctoratæ, quæ incesti damnatæ, vitæ defossæ sunt, quod sacra Vestæ matris polluisent, nec tamen, licet nocentes, extrâ urbem obruebantur, sed in Campo proximè Portam Collinam, qui sceleratus vocatur.* That the place was called *Campus Sceleratus*, as is here said by Cato, is also mentioned by Livy (viii. 15.), and this author appears justly to suppose, that it had that appellation from the very circumstance of its serving as the ground, where the polluted Vestals were interred—*Scelerato Campo, credo, ab incesto id ei loco nomen factum.* He farther says, that it was, *ad portam Collinam dextrâ viâ stratâ*, “near the porta Collina, on the right hand of the road,” which right hand, I presume, is to be understood, as you went out of the gate. And Plutarch describes it as ground somewhat rising, (Num. 10.), ὀφρὺς γεώδης, παρατείνουσα πόρῳ.

It is impossible to read the details of such an execution, as they are given by Plutarch (Num. 10), without shuddering. In the ground that has been described, a subterraneous chamber or cell of small dimension (κατάγειος οἶκος οὐ μέγας, Plut. Num. 10.; also called οἶκημα, ibid. σηκός, Dionys. Hal. ii. 67. Reiske. *Cubiculum subterraneum.* Plin. Ep. iv. 11.)—was formed (κατασκευάζεται), into which you descended from above (ἔχων ἄνωθεν, κατάβασιν). There were placed in it a couch or bed (κλίνη ὑπεστρωμένη), a burning lamp, and a few necessities of life (ἀπαρχαὶ τῶν πρὸς τὸ ζῆν ἀναγκαίων βραχεΐαι τινες), such as bread, water, milk, and oil. It would have been impious, according to Plutarch, to destroy by hunger, a life that had been consecrated by the most holy rites (ὥσπερ ἀφοσιουμένων τὸ μὴ λιμῷ διαφθεῖρειν σῶμα ταῖς μεγίσταις καθιερωμένον ἀγαστείαις). The wretched victim, it is to be imagined, chiefly perished by suffocation. For the cell was closely shut, and overlaid with earth, as soon as she was descended (τῆς δὲ καταβάσης, κατακρύπτεται τὸ οἶκημα γῆς πολλῆς ἄνωθεν ἐπιφορουμένης). The whole proceedings were terrific. The delinquent was conveyed to that place of horror in a litter, so fastened up and covered from without, that not even a sound or groan could escape from it. She was thus carried through the market-place (δὲ ἀγορᾶς; compare Dionys. Hal. viii. 89. Reiske), while the people, in fearful silence, made way, and followed speechless, impressed with the awe of this frightful ceremony. No sight, says Plutarch, could be more shocking, nor was there ever a day at Rome more gloomy and sorrowful. When the litter had arrived at its destination, the attending officers (οἱ ὑπηρέται) unloosened the covering. The chief, or leader, of the priests (ὁ τῶν ἱερέων ἑξάρχος, that is, of the pontiffs; see Plin. Ep. iv. 11.), having made a silent or secret prayer (εὐχὰς τινὰς ἀπορρήτως ποιησάμενος), spreading out his hands towards heaven, as if to call the gods to witness, how dire a necessity required this act (καὶ χεῖρας ἀνατείνας Θεοῖς πρὸς τῆς ἀνάγκης), led her forth from the litter, with her face veiled and covered (ἐξάγει συγκεκαλυμμένην), and placed her upon the ladder which led down to the chamber. He then turned away with the other priests, and when she had descended, the ladder was taken up, the opening covered over with earth, and

levelled with the other ground (ὥστ' ἰσόπεδον τῷ λοιπῷ χώματι γενέσθαι τὸν τύπον). When the priest had quitted the delinquent, the common executioner (*carnifex*, see Plin. Ep. iv. 11.) performed all the remainder of the office, that is to say, removed the ladder, closed the aperture, and threw on the earth. Such was this tremendous punishment, according to Plutarch's description. That which is given of it by Dionysius Hal. (ii. 67. Reiske) is less complete, and probably less accurate. He says, among other things, that the litter was attended by the friends and relations of the Vestal, who were weeping and lamenting (ἀνακλαιόμενων αὐτὰς καὶ προπεμπόντων φίλων τε καὶ συγγενῶν); whereas Plutarch states, that a mournful silence was observed (ἐξίστανται δὲ πάντες σιωπῇ, καὶ παραπέμπουσιν ἄφθογγοι μετὰ τινος δεινῆς κατηφείας). In another passage (ix. 40. Reiske), Dionysius relates, in one instance, that the Vestal, before she was led to death, underwent a flogging or scourging: ῥάβδους δὲ ἐμαστίγωσαν, καὶ πομπεύσαντες διὰ τῆς πόλεως, ἔωσαν κατῶρυξαν,—*they beat her with rods, and having conducted her through the town, buried her alive.* This additional severity I have no hesitation in discrediting, as it is not supported by any other testimony, upon any one occasion. I apprehend, as I have before intimated, that Dionysius is not to be depended upon for accuracy in particulars. Here he has evidently confounded the flogging, used under other circumstances, with the last punishment that the Vestals suffered. According to this author, Tarquinius Priscus was the inventor of the dreadful interment. See iii. 67. ed. Reiske.: δοκεῖ δὲ καὶ τὰς τιμωρίας, αἷς κολάζονται πρὸς τῶν ἱεροφαντῶν αἱ μὴ φυλάττονσαι τὴν παρθενίαν ἐκεῖνος (ὁ Ταρκύνιος) ἐξευρεῖν πρῶτος,—*that king (Tarquin the elder) seems also to have invented the punishment which is inflicted by the pontiffs, upon such of the Vestals as do not keep their virginity.* In the case of Ilia, or Rhea Sylvia, the mother of Romulus, the punishment that she was threatened with, for the transgression of which, as a Vestal, she had been guilty, was, as the same writer mentions, that of being beaten to death with rods, i. 78. Reiske.: ῥάβδους αἰκισθεῖσαν ἀποθανεῖν. Cedrenus, one of the Byzantine historians, a late writer (of the 11th century), and consequently of no weight in a matter of antiquity, says, that the polluted Vestals were, in early times, stoned to death, *lapidibus obruebantur*. But his own words (p. 118. D. Tom. viii. Corp. Histor. Byzant. ed. Van. 1729.) are: τὰς Ἑστιάδας παρθένους—αἱ δὲ διὰ τοῦ βίου τὴν παρθενίαν ἐφύλαττον· εἰ δὲ μὴ, λίθοις κατεχώννυντο. Plutarch, in *Quæstiones Romanæ* (Op. Tom. vii. p. 154. ed. Reiske.) attempts to explain the reason, why that particular punishment, of burying alive, was chosen for the Vestals. Among his conjectures, the most plausible seems to be, that a person so holy should not suffer the death of a common criminal, or be touched by the hands of the executioner: to avoid which, no mode could have been better contrived. She descended herself into the subterraneous cell, and thus was separated from the world and from life, without any act of violence.

This terrible mode of avenging the crime in question, one would

suppose, would have rendered the commission of it extremely rare. Nor are the examples which occur in Roman history perhaps to be considered as numerous, when the length of time, during which that establishment existed, at least *a thousand years*, is taken into account. I will in conclusion of this disquisition mention the most remarkable instances, which we meet with in the ancient writers. The first criminal of this kind that was condemned, we read of in Dionysius Hal. Her name was *Pinaria*, and the event happened under the elder Tarquin. See III. 67. ed. Reiske.: ἐφάνθη γάρ τις ἐπὶ τῆς ἐκείνου (Ταρκυνίου) βασιλείας ἱερεία Πινάρια, Ποπλίου θυγάτηρ, οὐχ ἄγνη προσιοῦσα τοῖς ἱεροῖς,—*in his reign the priestess Pinaria, the daughter of Publius, was discovered to discharge the sacred functions, when she was involved in the guilt of impurity.* The punishment, which was inflicted in such a case, is then alluded to. In Livy (VIII. 15.), the fate of *Minucia*, who was convicted and buried alive (in the year of Rome 417, before Christ, 337.) is recorded. In the year of Rome 538 (before Christ, 216.) two were condemned (*stupri compertæ*), *Opimia* and *Floronia*. Liv. XXII. 57.: *Ducæ Vestales eo anno, Opimia atque Floronia, stupri compertæ; et altera sub terram, ut mos est, ad portam Collinam necata fuerat; altera sibimet ipsi mortem consciverat.* These are the two Vestals of whom Plutarch speaks in Fab. Max. 18.—τῶν Ἑστιάδων παρθένων δύο διεφθαρμένας εὐρόντες, τὴν μὲν, ὥσπερ ἔστιν ἔθος, ζῶσαν κατέρωξαν, ἡ δὲ ὑφ' ἑαυτῆς ἀπέθανε,—*having detected two of the Vestal Virgins to be guilty of incontinence, they buried one of them alive, as is the established usage in such circumstances; the other put an end to herself by her own hands.* Dionysius Hal. (VIII. 89. Reiske) places the condemnation of *Opimia* in the consulate of M. Fabius (the son of Cæso), and L. Valerius (the son of Marcus), which is, in the year of Rome 271, before Christ 482. Here is a sad deviation from chronology, either on the part of Dionysius or of Livy. I am inclined rather to confide in the latter. The Vestal *Urbensia* was, according to Dionys. Hal. (IX. 40. ed. Reiske) condemned in the consulate of L. Pinarius and P. Furius, which falls in the year of Rome 282, before Christ 472. (see Almelooven, Fasti Consulares). To her pollution a plague, that raged at Rome, was imputed, and stopt by her punishment. In Dio Cassius, and the Epitome of the 63d book of Livy, three cases are recorded, which happened about the year of Rome 640, before Christ 114. The culprits, whose names were *Æmilia*, *Licinia*, and *Marcia*, all perished. See Dio Cass. fragm. Lib. XXXIV. p. 39. lin. 62. Freinshem. Supplem. ad Liv. lib. LXIII. 5—8. Domitian condemned four, viz. *Varonilla*, two sisters *Ocellatæ*, and *Cornelia*, who was *Virgo Maxima*. The latter was buried alive; to the three others he left the choice of their deaths. See Sueton. Domit. 8. Dio Cass. lib. LXVII. p. 1103. ed. Reimar. Philostrat. Vit. Apollon. Tyan. VII. 6. Suetonius represents this act of severity as a salutary correction of that dissoluteness, which, by the connivance of the preceding Emperors, had gained ground. *Incesta Vestalium Virginum, a patre quoque suo et fratre neglecta, variè ac severè coercuit.*

Philostratus also seems to speak of it with commendation : Dio Cassius merely touches upon it. But the younger Pliny, in detailing the fate of *Cornelia* (Epist. iv. 11.) gives the impression that her condemnation was a deed of the most wicked tyranny. He describes the anguish of the unhappy woman when her doom was announced to her. *Missi statim pontifices, qui defodiendam necandamque curarent. Illa nunc ad Vestam, nunc ad ceteros deos manus tendens, multa, sed hoc frequentissimè clamitabat, "Me Cæsar incestam putat, quâ sacra faciente, vicit, triumphavit!"* And he commemorates her last moments thus: *Quin etiam cùm in illud subterraneum cubiculum demitteretur hæsissetque descendenti stola, vertit se et recollegit. Cumque ei carnis-fex manum daret, aversata est, et resiliit, fœdumque contactum, quasi planè a casto puroque corpore, rejecit : omnibusque numeris pudoris πολλὴν πρόνοιαν εἶχεν εὐσχήμως πεσεῖν,*—"when she was let down into the subterraneous chamber, and her robe had caught in descending, she turned round and gathered it up. And when the executioner offered her his hand, she shrunk from it, and turned away with disgust; spurning the foul contact from her person, chaste, pure, and holy: and with all the deportment of modest grace, she scrupulously endeavoured to perish with propriety and decorum." That Pliny thought her innocent, and considered her death as a wanton piece of cruelty in that detested tyrant, appears from these words: *immanitate tyranni, qui illustrari sæculum suum ejusmodi exemplo arbitraretur.* The monster Caracalla (in the year of Rome 968) condemned five at once, of whom four, viz. *Clodia Læta, Aurelia Severa, Pomponia, Rufina*, were buried alive; the fifth, *Canutia*, to escape this horrid sentence, anticipated death, by throwing herself from the top of a house. This is related by Dio Cass. lib. LXXVII. p. 1302. ed. Reimar.

If it is to be wondered at, that notwithstanding so terrifying a preventive before the eyes of the Vestals, the crime should have been committed, it is certainly not less surprising, that there should have been men, so corrupt and desperate, as to rush into guilt, which not only brought destruction upon the unhappy females, but upon their own heads. For it will presently be seen, that the fate of the seducer was not much more enviable, than that of the seduced. It is very justly observed by Freinshemius (Supplem. in Liv. lib. LXIII. 7.): *perditis ingeniis severissimè vetita maximè expetuntur*; and several of those wretches, who are most distinguished in history for their wickedness, after having, as it were, glutted themselves with vice, are said to have found, in the perpetration of this crime, a means of gratification. Thus *Catiline* (see Sallust 15.), *Nero* (Sueton. 28.), *Caracalla* and *Elagabalus* (see Dio Cassius), are charged with its commission. Under circumstances where suspicion was so much upon the alert, and where the popular opinions and prejudices were so much interested, it cannot but sometimes have happened, that the innocent were accused. Dio Cassius (Fragm. lib. XXXIV. p. 39. lin. 46. ed. Reimar.) has a passage that bears upon this point; οὐδὲν ὄτι οὐχ ἡγε-

τόπου τῶν αἰσχίπτων καὶ ἀνοσιωτάτων δύνασθαι γενέσθαι· καὶ διὰ τοῦτο τὰς κολάσεις οὐ μόνον τῶν ἐλεγχθέντων, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν ἄλλων πάντων τῶν αἰτιασθέντων, μίσει τοῦ συμβεβηκότος ἐποίησαντο,—*there was nothing so criminal and wicked, which they did not presume might have taken place: and, for this reason, they inflicted the punishment, not only for what was proved, but also for every thing that was alleged, from irritation at the reverse that had occurred.* Plutarch (in M. Crassus c. 1.) relates, that a Vestal, by name *Licina*, was suspected of an improper intercourse with Crassus, for which charge there was probably no foundation. And the younger Cato vindicated another from suspicion, attempted to be thrown upon her, by that turbulent demagogue, Clodius. See Plutarch, Cato Minor. 19. By what means the Vestal *Æmilia* established her innocence, when she stood upon the precipice of that fatal suspicion, is told at large by Dionysius in a passage before adduced (II. 68. ed. Reiske). And the miraculous escape of *Tuccia* from ruin, is well known. It is she who proved her chastity by carrying water in a sieve, from the Tiber to the market-place, or the temple of Vesta. This fable, which is referred to the year of Rome 609, is gravely commemorated by Dionysius Hal. (II. 69. ed. Reiske), and Valerius Max. (VIII. 1. 5.); and seems to have been generally credited by the Roman people. Pliny (Nat. Hist. XXVIII. ed. Bip.) mentions, that the prayer, or address to the gods, which she used upon that occasion, existed to his day. *Extat Tucciæ, Vestalis incestæ* (i. e. of a Vestal accused of unchastity) *precatio, quâ usa aquam in cribro tulit.* And representations of the Vestal with the sieve are not uncommon. See Montfaucon's Antiquities.

The men who were the seducers (*stupratores*, or *corruptores*, as they were denominated,) were treated with corresponding severity. Their punishment was, to be beaten with rods, or flogged, in the assembly of the people, till they expired under the strokes. This was enacted by law, as Festus records, under the word *Probrum*, lib. XIV. p. 375. ed. Delphin. 1700.) *Probrum Virginis Vestalis ut capite puniretur, vir, qui eam incestavisset, verberibus necaretur: lex fixa in atrio Libertatis cum multis aliis legibus.* Examples of this punishment occur in the following passages, Liv. XXII. 57.: *L. Cantilius, scriba Pontificis, quos nunc minores pontifices appellant, qui cum Floroniâ stuprum fecerat, a Pontifice Maximo eò usque virgis in comitio cæsus erat, ut inter verbera expiraret.* Sueton. Domit. 8.: *stupratoresque virgis in comitio ad necem cædi.* Dionys. Hal. VIII. 89. ed. Reiske.: δύο δὲ τοὺς ἐξελεγχθέντας διαπράξασθαι τὴν φθορὰν, μαστιγώσαντες ἐν φανερώ, ἀπέκτειναν,—*the two men who were convicted as the seducers, they flogged to death in public.* And IX. 40.: τῶν δὲ διαπραξαμένων τὴν ἀνοσίαν φθορὰν ὁ μὲν ἕτερος εαυτὸν διεχρήσατο, τὸν δὲ ἕτερον οἱ τῶν ἱερῶν ἐπίσκοποι συλλαβόντες, ἐν ἀγορᾷ μάστιξιν αἰκισάμενοι, καθάπερ ἀνδράποdon, ἀπέκτειναν,—*of those who were the perpetrators of that abominable corruption, one put an end to himself by suicide, and the other, being apprehended by the pontiffs, was, in the market-place, flogged to death like a slave.* The mode of execution

was this : the neck of the criminal was fastened in a *furca*, or sort of wooden collar, and then the rods or sticks were applied to the naked body, till he breathed his last. So Suetonius (Nero, 49.) describes it : *nudi hominis cervicem inseri furcæ, corpus virgis ad necem cædi*. That was *puniri more majorum*, as the same author intimates, and seems to have been adapted to this, as well as to other great offences.

COLLECTION OF THE CHALDEAN ORACLES.

PART I.

THE following remains of Chaldean theology are not only venerable for their antiquity, but inestimably valuable for the unequalled sublimity of the doctrines they contain. They will, doubtless, too, be held in the highest estimation by every liberal mind, when it is considered that some of them are the sources whence the sublime conceptions of Plato flowed ; that others are perfectly conformable to his most abstruse dogmas ; and that the most important part of them was corrupted by the Gnostics, and, in this polluted state, became the fountains of barbarous and gigantically daring impiety.

That they are of Chaldaic origin, and were not forged by Christians of any denomination, as has been asserted by some superficial writers, is demonstrably evident from the following considerations : In the first place, John Picus, earl of Mirandula, in a letter to Ficinus, informs him that he was in possession of the Oracles of Zoroaster in the Chaldean tongue, with a commentary on them, by certain Chaldean wise men. And that he did not speak this from mere conjecture (as Fabricius thinks he did) is evident from his expressly asserting, in a letter to Urbinatus (p. 256 of his works), that, after much labour, he had at length learned the Chaldean language. And still farther, as we shall see, he has inserted in his works fifteen conclusions, founded on this very Chaldean manuscript. That this circumstance should have escaped the notice of mere verbalists, is not surprising ; but it is singular that it should not have been attended to by a man of such uncommon crudition, and extensive reading, as Fabricius.

In the next place, as Porphyry, Iamblichus, and Proclus, wrote large commentaries on these oracles, and are well known to have ranked amongst the greatest enemies of the Christian religion; there is not even poetical probability, that men of such great learning and sagacity should have been duped by the shallow artifice of some heretical Christian knave. To which we may add, that Porphyry, in his life of Plotinus, expressly mentions, that certain revelations ascribed to Zoroaster, were circulated, in his time, by many Christians and heretics who had abandoned the ancient philosophy, and that he showed, by many arguments, these revelations were spurious; from which it is evident, that the oracles commented on by him, were not those forged by the heretics of his time.

In the third place, Proclus in his MS. Scholia on the Cratylus of Plato, says, that the Oracles respecting the *intelligible* and *intellectual orders* were delivered by Theurgists, under the reign of Marcus Antoninus.¹ It is clear, therefore, that the following oracles, which are collected from the writings of the Platonists, are of Chaldean, and not of Christian origin; not to mention that the dogmas they contain are totally dissonant from those of the Christian faith.

It is likewise evident, that some of these oracles may, with great confidence, be ascribed to the Chaldean Zoroaster. This appears from the Chaldean manuscript of Picus, in which those oracles were denominated Zoroastrian, which exist at present, with the Scholia of Psellus, under the title of *The Magic Oracles of Zoroaster*.

In consequence of this, I have distributed these oracles into four parts. The first division I denominate *The Oracles of Zoroaster*; the second, *Oracles delivered by Theurgists, under the reign of Marcus Antoninus*; because the oracles in this division relate to the intelligible and intellectual orders. The third division I call, *Oracles which were either delivered by Theurgists, under Marcus Antoninus, or by Zoroaster*; because the collection of Psellus is

¹ Οὕτω καὶ τοῖς ἐπὶ ΜΑΡΚΟΥ γενομένοις θεουργοῖς οἱ θεοὶ ὡς νοήτας καὶ νοήτας, ταξίαις ἐκφαιδύοντες, νοήματα τῶν θεῶν διακοσμῶν ἐξαγγελτικὰ τῆς εἰδοτικῆς αὐτῶν παραδεδασκίαν, ὡς καλοῦντες ἐκίαντες τοὺς θεοὺς ἐν ταῖς προσηκούσαις θιγαίαις, τῆς παρ' αὐτῶν εὐχαρίαις ἐνυχαρίαν.

far from being complete, as we shall see from the conclusions of Picus, and the oracles in this division do not immediately relate to the intelligible and intellectual orders. The fourth division contains a few oracles of uncertain, or imperfect meaning, which I have thus denominated, from not having the MSS. in my possession, from which they were collected.

The learned reader will easily perceive that my labour, in forming this collection, must have been great, as I have accurately arranged each oracle under its proper head, and have given the authors and places where each (a few only excepted) may be found. He will likewise find, that I have added fifty Chaldean oracles, and fragments of oracles, to the collection of Patricius; and that I have given a far more correct edition of the text, than that of Le Clerc. Short notes are added, by way of comment, on the most obscure of these oracles, and the exposition of Psellus is prefixed as containing the best account of the Chaldaic dogmas that can, at present, be obtained.

Manor-Place, Walkworth.

T. TAYLOR.

A CONCISE EXPOSITION OF CHALDAIC DOGMAS, BY
PSELLUS.

“ They assert that there are seven corporeal worlds, one Emphyrean and the first; after this, three etherial, and then three material worlds,¹ the last of which is said to be terrestrial, and the hater of life: and this is the sublunary place, containing likewise in itself matter, which they call a profundity. They are of opinion, that there is one principle of things; and this they celebrate as *the one*, and *the good*.² After this, they venerate a certain paternal profundity,³ consisting of three triads; but each triad contains, *father*, *power*, and *intellect*. After this is the intelligible *Iynx*,⁴ then the

¹ These three material worlds, are the inerratic sphere, the seven planetary spheres, and the sublunary regions.

² So Plato.

³ This is called, by the Platonists, the *intelligible triad*; and is celebrated by Plato in the *Philebus*, under the names of *bound*, *infinite*, and the *mixed*; and likewise of *symmetry*, *truth*, and *beauty*, which triad, he says, is seated in the vestibule of the *good*.

⁴ The *Iynx*, *Synoches*, and *Teletarchæ* of the Chaldeans, compose that divine order which is called, by the Platonists, the *intelligible*, and, at the same time, *intellectual order*; and is celebrated by Plato in the *Phædrus*, under the names of the *supercelestial place*, *Heaven*, and the *subcelestial arch*.

Synoches, of which one is empyrean, the other etherial, and the third material. The *Teletarchæ* follow the *Synoches*. After these succeed the *fontal fathers*,¹ who are also called *Cosmagogi*, or *leaders of the world*. Of these, the first is called *once beyond*, the second is *Hecate*, and the third is *twice beyond*. After these are the three *Amilicti*;² and, last of all, the *Upezokus*. They likewise venerate a fontal triad of *faith, truth, and love*. They assert that there is a ruling sun from a solar fountain, and an archangelic sun; that there is a fountain of sense, a fontal judgment, a thundering fountain, a dioptric fountain, and a fountain of characters, seated in unknown impressions. And, again, that there are fontal summits of Apollo, Osiris, and Hermes. They likewise assert that there are *material fountains* of centres and elements; that there is a zone of dreams, and a fontal soul.

After the fountains, they say, the *principles*³ succeed: for fountains are superior to principles. But of the *vivific*⁴ *principles*, the summit is called *Hecate*, the middle *ruling soul*, and the extremity *ruling virtue*. They have likewise *azonic Hecatæ*, such as the Chaldaic *Trieclotis*, *Comas*, and *Ecklustike*. But the *azonic*⁵ gods, according to them, are *Serapis*, *Bacchus*, the series of *Osiris*, and of *Apollo*. These gods are called *azonic*, because they rule without restraint over the zones, and are established above the apparent gods. But the *zonic* gods are those which revolve round the celestial zones, and rule over sublunary affairs, but not with the same unrestrained energy, as the *azonic*. For the Chaldeans consider the *zonic* order as divine; as distributing the parts of the sensible world; and as begirding the allotments about the material region.

The *inerratic circle* succeeds the zones, and comprehends the seven spheres in which the stars are placed. According to them, likewise, there are *two solar worlds*; one, which is subservient to the etherial profundity; the other *zonaic*, being one of the seven spheres.

¹ These fontal fathers compose the *intellectual* triad of the Greeks, and are *Saturn*, *Rhea*, *Jupiter*.

² The three *Amilicti* are the same with the *unpolluted triad*, or *Curetes*, of the Greeks. Observe, that a *fontal subsistence* means a *subsistence according to cause*.

³ These *principles* are the same with the Platonic *supermundane* order of gods.

⁴ The *vivific* triad consists, according to the Greek Theologists, of *Diana*, *Proserpine*, and *Minerva*.

⁵ The *azonic* gods are the same with the *liberated* order of the Greek Theologists, or that order which is immediately situated above the *mundane* gods.

Of human souls, they establish a twofold fontal cause; viz. the *paternal intellect*,¹ and the *fontal soul*:² and they consider partial³ souls, as proceeding from the fontal, according to the will of the father. Souls of this kind, however, possess a self-begotten, and self-vital essence: for they are not like alter-motive natures. Indeed, since according to the Oracle, a partial soul is a portion of divine fire, a splendid fire, and a paternal conception, it must be an immaterial and self-subsistent essence; for every thing divine is of this kind; and of this the soul is a portion. They assert too, that all things are contained in each soul; but that in each there is an unknown characteristic of an effable and ineffable impression. They are of opinion, that the soul often descends into the world, through many causes; either through the defluxion of its wings,⁴ or through the paternal will. They believe the world to be eternal, as likewise the periods of the stars. They multifariously distribute Hades, at one time calling it the leader of a terrene allotment, and at another the sublunary region. Sometimes they denoninate it, the most inward of the etherial and material worlds; at another time, irrational⁵ soul. In this, they place the rational soul, not essentially, but according to habitude, when it sympathises with it, and energises according to partial reason.

They consider *ideas*, at one time, as the conceptions of the *father*;⁶ at another time, as universal reasons, viz. physical, psychical, and intelligible; and again, as the exempt hyparxes (or summits) of beings. They assert that magical operations are accomplished through the intervention of the highest powers, and terrene substances; and that superior natures sympathise with inferior, and especially with those in the sublunary region. They consider souls, as restored after death to their pristine perfection, in the *wholes*⁷ of the universe, according to the measures of their peculiar purifications; but some souls are raised by them to a supermundane condition of being. They likewise define souls to be media between impartible and partible natures. With respect to these dogmas, many of them are adopted by Plato⁸ and Aristotle: but Plotinus, Porphyry, Jamblichus, Proclus, and their

¹ The *Jupiter* of the Greeks, the artificer of the universe.

² Called by the Greeks, *Juno*.

³ That is, such souls as ours.

⁴ So Plato: see my translation of the *Phædrus*.

⁵ Hades is with great propriety thus called: for the rational, when giving itself up to the dominion of the irrational soul, may be truly said to be situated in *Hades*, or *obscurity*.

⁶ i. e. *Jupiter*, or the *Demiurgus*.

⁷ That is to say, the *celestial and sublunary spheres*.

⁸ Indeed, he who has penetrated the profundity of Plato's doctrines, will find that they perfectly accord with these Chaldaic dogmas; as is every where copiously shown by Proclus.

disciples, adopt the whole of them, and admit them without hesitation, as doctrines of a divine origin."

Thus far Psellus: I add, for the sake of those readers that are unacquainted with the scientific theology of the ancients, that as the highest principle of things is a nature truly ineffable and unknown, it is impossible that this visible world could have been produced by him without media; and this not through any impotency, but, on the contrary, through transcendency of power. For if he had produced all things without the agency of intermediate beings, all things must have been like himself, ineffable and unknown. It is necessary, therefore, that there should be certain mighty powers between the supreme principle of things and us: for we, in reality, are nothing more than the dregs of the universe. These mighty powers, from their surpassing similitude to the first God, were very properly called by the ancients gods; and were considered by them as perpetually subsisting in the most admirable and profound union with each other, and the first cause; yet so as amidst this union to preserve their own energy distinct from that of the highest god. For it would be absurd in the extreme, to allow, that man has a peculiar energy of his own, and to deny that this is the case with the most exalted beings. Hence, as Proclus beautifully observes, the gods may be compared to trees rooted in the earth: for as these, by their roots, are united with the earth, and become earthly in an eminent degree, without being earth itself; so the gods, by their summits, are profoundly united to the first cause, and by this mean are transcendently similar to, without being, the first cause.

Lines too, emanating from the centre of a circle, afford us a conspicuous image of the manner in which these mighty powers proceed from, and subsist in, the ineffable principle of things. For here, the lines are evidently things different from the centre, to which, at the same time, by their summits, they are exquisitely allied. All these summits too, which are indescribably absorbed in centre, are yet no parts (i. e. powers) of it; for the centre has a subsistence prior to them, as being their cause.

THE ORACLES OF ZOROASTER.

N. B. Wherever a star occurs prefixed to an oracle, it denotes that oracle to be an additional one, first discovered by me.

Ἔστι καὶ εἰδῶλη μερὶς εἰς τόπον ἀμφίφαινοντα. ¹

'There is also a portion for the image' in the place³ every way splendid.

Μη δε το της υλης σκυβαλον κρημων καταλειψης.

Nor should you leave the dregs of matter³ in the precipice.⁴

Μη εξαΐης, ινα μη εξη εχουσα τι.

Nor should you expel the soul from the body, lest in departing it retain something.⁵

Μη τα πελωρια μετρα γαιης υπο σην φρενα βαλλου.

Ου γαρ αληθεις ζυτον ενι χθονι.

Μηδς μετρει μετρα ηλιου κανονας συναθροισας.

Αϊδιω βουλη φερεται πατρος, ουχ ενεκεν σου.

Μηνς ροιζον εασον· ασι τρεχει εργω αναγκης.

Αστεριον προπορευμα σεθεν χαριν ουχ ελοχευθη.

Αιθριος ορνιθων ταρσος πλατυς, ου ποτ' αληθης.

Και θυσιων σπλαγχνων τε τομαι· τα δ' αθυρματα παντα,

Εμπορικης απατης στηριγματα. Φευγε συ ταυτα,

Μελλων ευσεβδης ιερην παραδεισον ανοιγειν,

Ενθ' αρετη σοφια τε και ευνομια συναγονται.

Direct not your attention to the immense measures of the earth; for the plant of truth is not in the earth. Nor measure the dimensions of the sun, by means of collected rules; for it revolves by the eternal will of the father, and not for your sake. Dismiss the sounding course of the moon; for it perpetually runs through the exertions of necessity. The advancing procession of the stars was not generated for your sake. The wide-spread aerial wing of birds, and the sections of victims and viscera are never true: but all these are mere puerile sports, the foundations of mercantile deception. Fly from these, if you intend to open the sacred paradise of piety, where virtue, wisdom, and equity are collected together.⁶

Διξο ψυχης οχετον, οθεν η τινη ταξις

Σωματι θετευσας, επι ταξιν αφ' ης ερρυση.

Αυθις αναστησεις, ιερω λογω εργον ενωσας.

Explore the river⁷ of the soul, whence, or in what order, having

¹ That is, the irrational soul, which is the image of the rational.

² That is, the region above the moon. ³ i. e. The human body.

⁴ i. e. This terrestrial region.

⁵ i. e. Lest it retain something of the more passive life.

⁶ This oracle is conformable to what Plato says in his Republic, that a philosopher must astronomise above the heavens: that is to say, he must speculate the celestial orbs, as nothing more than images of forms in the intelligible world.

⁷ i. e. The producing cause of the soul.

become a servant to body, you may again rise to that order from which you flowed, uniting operation to *sacred* reason.¹

Μη κατω νευσης, κρημνος κατα γης υποκειται,
Επταπορου συρων κατα βαθμιδος ην υπο δεινης
Αναγκης θρονος εστι.

Verge not downwards, a precipice lies under the earth, which draws through a descent of seven steps,² and under which lies the throne of dire necessity.

Ονοματα βαρβαρα μη ποτ' αλλαξης.
You should never change barbarous names.³
Πως εχει κισμος νοερους ανοχης ακαμψεις.

In a certain respect the world possesses intellectual inflexible sustainers.⁴

Ενεργει περι τον εκατικον στροφαλον.
Energise about the Hecatic sphere.⁵

Πολλακις ην λεξης μοι, αθησης παντα λεοντα,
Ουτε γαρ ουρανιος κυρτος τοτε φαινεται ογκος,
Αστερες ου λαμπουσι, το μηνης φως κεκαλυπτται,
Χθων ουχ εστηκε βλεπεται δε παντα κεραυνοις.

If you often invoke *me*,⁶ all things will appear to you to be a lion. For neither will the convex bulk of heaven then be visible; the stars will not shine; the light of the moon will be concealed; the earth will not stand firm; but all things will be seen in thunder.

Παντοθεν απλαστω ψυχη πυρος ηνια τεινον.
On all sides, with an unfigured⁷ soul, extend the reins of fire.

Ω τολημρας της φυσεως ανθρωπε τεχνασμα.
O man, thou subtle production,⁸ that art of a bold nature!

Αιης εν λαγοςιν Εκατης αρετης πελεπηγη,
Ενδον ολη μενουσα, το παρθενιον ου προΐεσα.

¹ By sacred reason is meant the summit, or principal power of the soul, which Zoroaster, in another place, calls the flower of intellect.

² i. e. The orbs of the seven planets.

³ For in every nation there are names of divine origin, and which possess an ineffable power in mystic operations.

⁴ i. e. The fountal fathers, or intellectual gods. By *inflexible*, understand stable power.

⁵ This sphere was of gold. In the middle of it there was a sapphire; and the sphere itself was turned round by means of a thong, made of the hide of an ox. It was likewise every where inscribed with characters: and the Chaldeans turning it round, made certain invocations. But it is called Hecateine, because dedicated to Hecate.

⁶ By *me* is meant the fountain or cause of the celestial constellation called the lion.

⁷ By *unfigured*, understand most simple and pure: and by the reins of fire, the unimpeded energy of the theurgic life of such a soul.

⁸ Man is a subtle production, considered as the work of the *secret* art of

In the left-hand inward parts of Hecate¹ is the fountain of virtue, which wholly abides within, and does not emit its virginal nature.

Ηνικα μὲν βλεψῆς μορφῆς ἀτὲρ εὐϊερον πυρ,
Λαμπομενον σκιρτηδον ολου κατα βενθεα κισμου,
Κλυθι πυρος φωνην.

When you behold a sacred fire² without form, shining with a leaping splendour through the profundities of the whole world, hear the voice of fire.

Μη φυσεως καλεσης αυτοπτον αγαλμα.

You should not invoke the self-conspicuous image of nature.³

Η φυσις πειθει ειναι τους δαιμονας αγνους,
Και τα κακης υλης βλαστηματα, χρηστα και εσθλα.

Nature persuades us, that there are holy dæmons, and that the blossoms of depraved matter⁴ are useful and good.

Ψυχῃ η μεροπων θεον αγχει πως ες εαυτην,
Ουδεν θνητον εχουσα, ολη θεοθεν μεμεθυσται.
Αρμονια αυχει γαρ, υφ' η πελε σωμα βροτειον.

⁵ The soul of mortals compels, in a certain respect, divinity into itself, possessing nothing mortal, and is wholly inebriated from deity: for it glories in the harmony⁶ under which the mortal body subsists.

Ηγεισθω ψυχης βαθος αμβροτον, ομματα δ' αρδην
Παντα εκπετασον ανω.

The immortal depth⁷ of the soul should be the leader; but vehemently extend all your eyes⁸ upwards.

Μη πνευμα μολυνης μη δε βαθυνης το επιπεδον.

You should not defile the spirit,⁹ nor give depth to a superficies.

divinity. But he is of a bold nature, as exploring things more excellent than himself.

¹ Hecate, according to the Chaldeans, is the centre of the intellectual gods: and they say that in her right-hand parts she contains the fountain of souls; and in her left, the fountain of the virtues.

² This oracle relates to the vision of divine light.

³ *i. e.* The image to be invoked in the mysteries must be intelligible, and not sensible.

⁴ By the blossoms of depraved matter, understand the dæmons called *Evil*; but which are not so essentially, but from their office.

⁵ That is, the human soul, through its immortality and purity, becomes replete with a more excellent life, and divine illumination; and is, as it were, raised above itself.

⁶ *i. e.* Unapparent and intelligible harmony.

⁷ *i. e.* The summit or flower of its nature.

⁸ *i. e.* All the gnostic powers of the soul.

⁹ Understand by the *spirit*, the ærial vehicle of the soul; and by the *superficies*, the ethereal and lucid vehicle.

Ζητήσον παραδείσον.

Seek Paradise.¹

Σὺν ἀγγείων θηρῶν χθονὸς οἰκησούσιν.

² The wild beasts of the earth shall inhabit thy vessel.

Ἐκτεινας πυρίνον νοῦν

Ἐργον ἐπ' εὐσεβείης, ρευστον καὶ σῶμα σώσεις.

By extending a fiery intellect³ to the work of piety, you will also preserve the flowing body.

Ἐκ δ' ἀρα κολπῶν

Γαίης θρωσκουσι χθονιοὶ κύνες, οὐποτ' ἀληθές

Σήμα βροτῶ ἀνδρὶ δεικνυντες.

From the bosom therefore of the earth terrestrial dogs⁴ leap forth, who never exhibit a true sign to mortal man.

Πάντα γὰρ ἐξετέλεσσε πατήρ, καὶ νῦν παρεδωκε

Δευτέρῳ, ὃν πρῶτον κληῖζεται ἐθνέα ἀνδρῶν.

The Father⁵ perfected all things, and delivered them to the second intellect,⁶ which the nations of men call the first.

Αἱ ποινὰι μεροπῶν ἀγκυραὶ.

The furies are the bonds of men.⁷

Συμβόλα γὰρ πατρικὸς νοῦς ἐσπεῖρε ταῖς ψυχαῖς.

The paternal intellect disseminated symbols⁸ in souls.

Βίη σῶμα λιποντῶν ψυχαὶ καθαρῶταται.

Those souls that leave the body with violence are most pure.⁹

Ὅτι ψυχὴ πῦρ δύναμει πατρὸς οὐσα φαεινόν,

Ἀθανάτος τε μένει καὶ ζωῆς δεσποτίζεισσι,

Καὶ ἰσχεῖ κόσμου πολλὰ πληρωμὰτα κολπῶν.

The soul being a splendid fire, through the power of the father remains immortal, is the mistress¹⁰ of life, and possesses many perfections of the bosoms of the world.

¹ The Chaldaic Paradise is the choir of divine powers about the Father of the universe; and the empyrean beauties of the demiurgic fountains.

² By the vessel is meant the composite temperature of the soul; and by the wild beasts of the earth, terrestrial dæmons. These, therefore, will reside in the soul which is replete with irrational affections.

³ *i. e.* An intellect full of divine light. ⁴ *i. e.* Material dæmons.

⁵ *i. e.* Saturn.

⁶ *i. e.* Jupiter.

⁷ That is, the powers that punish guilty souls, bind them to their material passions, and in these, as it were, suffocate them: such punishment being finally the means of purification. Nor do these powers only afflict the vicious, but even such as convert themselves to an immaterial essence: for these, through their connection with matter, require a purification of this kind.

⁸ That is, symbols of all the divine natures.

⁹ This oracle praises a violent death, because the soul, in this case, is induced to hate the body, and rejoice in a liberation from it.

¹⁰ The soul is the mistress of life, because she extends vital illuminations to body, which is, of itself, destitute of life.

* Πατρὸς οὐ φόβον ἐνθρῶσκει, πείθω δ' ἐπιχέει.

The father did not hurl forth fear, but infused persuasion. ¹

Ἐαυτὸν ὁ πατὴρ ἤρπασεν,

Οὐδ' ἐν ἐν δυνάμει νοερά κλείσας ἰδίον πυρ.

The father ² has hastily withdrawn himself, but has not shut up his proper fire, in his own intellectual power.

Ἔστι τι νοητὸν, ὃ χρὴ σε νοεῖν νοῦο ἀνθεῖ.

There is a certain intelligible ³ which it becomes you to understand with the flower of intellect.

Ψυχῆς ἐξωσθηρὲς ἀναπνοαὲς εὐλυτοὶ εἰσι.

The expelling powers ⁴ of the soul which cause her to respire, are of an unrestrained nature.

Χρὴ σε σπευδεῖν πρὸς τὸ φῶς καὶ πατρὸς ἀνγας,

Ἐνθὲν ἐπεμῆθη σοὶ ψυχή, πολὺν ἐσσημενὴ νοῦν.

It becomes you to hasten to the light and the rays of the Father, whence a soul was imparted to you, invested with an abundance of intellect.

Εἰσι πάντα πυρὸς ἐνὸς ἐκγεγαῶτα.

All things are the progeny of one fire. ⁵

Ἄ νοὺς λέγει, τῷ νοεῖν δηποῦ λέγει.

That which intellect says, it undoubtedly says by intellection. ⁶

Ἀ Ἀ τοὺς δὲ χθὼν κατωρρεταὶ ἐς τεχνὰ μέχρῃς.

Ha! ha! the earth from beneath bellows at these as far as to their children. ⁷

Μὴ συναυξήσῃς τὴν εἰμαρμένην.

You should not increase your fate. ⁸

Οὐ γὰρ ἀπο πατρικῆς ἀρχῆς ἀτέλεις τι τροχάζει.

¹ That is, as divinity is not of a tyrannical nature, he draws every thing to himself by persuasion, and not by fear.

² That is, Saturn, the summit of the intellectual order, is perfectly separated from all connection with matter; but, at the same time, imparts his divinity to inferior natures.

³ Meaning the intelligible, which immediately subsists after the highest God.

⁴ That is, those powers of the soul which separate it from the body.

⁵ That is, of one divine nature.

⁶ That is, the voice of intellect is an intellectual, or in other words, an immaterial and indivisible energy.

⁷ The meaning of the oracle is, that even the very children of the impious are destined to subterranean punishments; and this, with the greatest propriety; for those who, in a former life, have perpetrated similar crimes, become, through the wise administration of Providence, the members of one family.

⁸ *Fate* is the full perfection of those divine illuminations which are received by *Nature*; but *Providence* is the immediate energy of deity. Hence, when we energise intellectually, we are under the dominion of

Nothing imperfect proceeds, according to a circular energy, from a paternal principle.¹

* ΑΛΛ' οὐκ εἰσδεχεται κεινῆς το θελεῖν πατρικὸς νοῦς
Μεχρις ἂν ἐξελθῇ λήθης, καὶ ῥῆμα λαλήσῃ
Μνημὴν ἐνθεμενὴ πατρικὸν συνθήματος ἀγνοῦ.

But the paternal intellect will not receive the will of the soul, till she has departed from oblivion;² and has spoken the word, assuming the memory of her paternal sacred impression.

Πνικὰ δ' ἐρχομενον προσγειον δαίμον' ἀθήρησ',
Θυε λίθον Μνίζουριν ἐπαυδῶν.

When you behold the terrestrial³ dæmon approaching, vociferate and sacrifice the stone MNIZURIM.

Μανθάνε το νοητον ἐπεὶ νοῦν ἐξω υπαρχεῖ.

Learn the intelligible, for it subsists beyond intellect.⁴

Νοοῦμεναι ἰσχυγες πατροθεν νοεουσι καὶ αὐταὶ

Βουλαις ἀβθεγκτοισι κινουμεναι ὥστε νοησαι.

The intelligible Iynges⁵ possess intellection themselves from the Father, so far as they energize intellectually, being moved by ineffable councils.

The above Zoroastrian Oracles are from Psellus.

CRITIQUE ON OSSIAN'S TEMORA,

Shewing its great resemblance to the Poems of Homer, Virgil, and Milton.

PART II.—(Continued from No. XXVIII. p. 276.)

AMONG the bodies of the inanimate world, the diamond is distinguished by the peculiar hardness of its texture, which resists

Providence; but when corporeally, under that of Fate. The oracle therefore admonishes to withdraw ourselves from corporeal energy.

¹ For divinity is self-perfect; and the imperfect cannot proceed from the perfect.

² That is, till she has recovered her knowledge of the divine symbols, and sacred reasons, from which she is composed; the former of which she receives from the divine unities, and the latter from the sacred ideas.

³ Terrestrial dæmons are full of deceit, as being remote from divine knowledge, and replete with dark matter: he, therefore, who desires to receive any true information from one of these, must prepare an altar, and sacrifice the stone *Mnizurim*, which has the power of causing another greater dæmon to appear, who, approaching invisible to the material dæmon, will give a true answer to the proposed question; and this to the interrogator himself.

⁴ The intelligible is two-fold; one kind being co-ordinate with intellect, but the other being of a super-essential characteristic.

⁵ See the concise Exposition of Psellus, prefixed to these oracles.

the impression of every object to which it is opposed. In a similar manner, we discover, among epic writers, the poet of intrinsic genius by his display of human character: this knowledge of the manners of men is the test by which we are enabled to decide upon the genuineness of the coin. Let us examine, therefore, how far Ossian has either performed or neglected the precepts which regulate this department of the heroic poem.

The characters, according to Aristotle, should be marked and well distinguished. They should have some ruling virtue or passion, to which all their actions may be attributed, and which is the source from which they spring. The poet must exercise his judgment in the choice of character: for, although among mankind we meet with many individuals who order their lives according to no fixed system of conduct; whose actions are the offspring of no one parent-passion, but seem to be generated by a multiplicity of principles, in kind often dissimilar and sometimes opposite; yet such loose and indeterminate characters are by no means suitable to the epopee. So, at least, I understand the author of the *Treatise on Poetry*, when he says, that the characters ought to be good.' The characters should likewise be proper. Old age must not be hurried on with the ardor and impetuosity of youth: nor must the young warrior fight with the caution, and speak with the garrulity, of him who has lived three ages. But to distinctness and propriety of character must be added consistency and uniformity. The coward, who once flies, must always shrink from his opponent; and the hero, who in the outset attacks his enemies with bravery, must continue the same courageous personage throughout the poem; or, if at any time a brave man retreats before a superiority of numbers, he must do so with dignity.

“ Thus the grim lion his retreat maintains,
Beset with watchful dogs and shouting swains;
Long stands the show’ring darts and missile fires,
Then sourly slow the indignant beast retires.”

This elucidation of manners is the great bulwark of Homer, which has ensured to him the entire pre-eminence over all poets, antient and modern. Not only do the principal actors in his *Iliad* shine forth with an extraordinary degree of sublime grandeur; but those very individuals, whose character would naturally create aversion, if not detestation, are placed in situations which interest our

¹ Περὶ δὲ τὰ ἦθη τίτταρά ἐστιν, ὧν διὰ στοχάζεσθαι· ἐν μὲν καὶ πρῶτον, ὅπως χρηστὰ ἦ. Ἐξὺ δὲ ἦθος μὲν, ἰάν, ὥσπερ ἐλέχθη, ποιῇ φανερόν ὁ λόγος, ἢ ἡ πρᾶξις, προαίρεισιν τινὶ φαῦλον μὲν, ἰάν φαῦλην χρηστὸν δὲ, ἰάν χρηστὴν. Ἔστι δὲ ἐν ἰκάλῳ γενεῖ, &c. Aris. de Poet. Edit. Tyrwhitt. Sec. 28.

Notandi sunt tibi mores. Hor. Ar. Poet.

celings in their behalf, and make our hearts sympathise with them. While the mere armour of Achilles drove the victorious Trojans to the gates of their city, the graceful appearance of Helen, the malignant source from which flowed all the Grecian and Trojan sorrows, melted the soul of even the aged warriors of Troy. But, in this respect, the mighty powers of the poet have been exerted to a degree which is questionable, if not faulty. The warlike son of Priam, who bade adieu to his Andromache with the utmost tenderness of conjugal affection, and unhelmed his brows to salute the living testimony of their loves, diminishes too much our anxiety for the success of Achilles, and afflicts our mind for the disasters of Ilium. But the variety is as wonderful as the sublimity of his characters. Here too, however, the poet seems to have strained his invention: his heroes would, perhaps, lose nothing if deprived of the foolery of Thersites, and his gods would be more dignified without the buffoonery of Vulcan.

In this circumstance there is something remarkable,—that in the same part in which Homer has excelled, Virgil has been deficient. His characters are neither so grand, so interesting, nor so varied as those of Homer. His Æneas, without a single frailty, is a lifeless personage, who must, when considered deliberately, command our admiration, but does never, at the time, warm our affections.

The subject of the *Paradise Lost* did not afford great scope for variety of character; but Milton has introduced all the variety of which his work was capable. In the squeamishness of criticism it might be said, that he has fallen, in some measure, into the error of Homer, by exalting too much the enemy of mankind. He has cast over Satan a profusion of light, which has thrown Adam into the shade.

If Ossian, in the drawing of character, has fallen short of the perfection of the Father of Poetry; and has neither shown so great a penetration into the science of man, nor introduced so much variety into the poem of *Temora*, he has, at least, surpassed Virgil both in the diversity and in the execution of his designs. But perhaps the characters of *Temora* are as much varied, as the age and country of the poet permitted. It is somewhat to be wondered that Virgil, in the characteristical part of the poem, has fallen short of the two earlier poets; as the age of refinement in which he wrote must have presented a more extended field of human action, for the occupations of men multiply with the progress of society, and a multiplicity of employment must augment the variety of character. But this advantage was counterbalanced by a disadvantage of superior weight. Although man, in an improved condition, is coloured with tints of character more varied than in a rude state, yet these colours must be very narrowly inspected be-

fore the observer can discover distinctly what ray of light they diffuse. In the childhood of society, the actions, and the motives which lead to them, are closely connected, and their connexion is easily discoverable: on the contrary, when society has grown up, man finds an interest in concealing the motives of many of his actions, and covers them accordingly with a veil, frequently too thick for penetration. If Virgil, therefore, surveyed a field of larger dimensions, he had more difficulty in discriminating the particular plants which grew in it; and, although the narrow field which Homer and Ossian surveyed, presented a very limited variety of species, yet these were well marked, and could easily be distinguished from each other.

Bravery is the predominant feature of all Ossian's actors: but, although they are all brave, the bravery of each is different in kind, and every actor possesses his own peculiarity of character. Fingal, the hero of the poem, is perhaps the only instance that can be adduced, not only in modern times, but in all antiquity, of "a man of perfect and consummate virtue," in whose successes and misfortunes we feel fully interested. He is the warrior of his age, the avenger of the wrongs of the injured, and, in peace, the promoter of his people's happiness, and the source of their prosperity: he never undervalues the virtues of his enemies, nor glories over the calamities of a fallen foe: wherever he directs his steps victory attends him, and even at his name his opponents tremble: he teems with an affectionate love towards his children, and is agitated with a generous concern about the welfare of his friends: in short, he is almost a god in the habit of mortality: he is clothed with the perfections of Æneas, without his insipidity, and shines in the virtues of Hector, without his ferocity. The reason of the success of Ossian, in thus pourtraying the utmost perfection of human nature, without diminishing our interest in the character, has been correctly and beautifully pointed out by Dr. Blair.¹ "To this it has much contributed," says he, "that the poet has represented him as an old man; and by this has gained the advantage of throwing around him a great many circumstances peculiar to that age, which paint him to the fancy in a more distinct light. He is surrounded by his family; he instructs his children in the principles of virtue; he is narrative of his past exploits; he is venerable with the grey locks of age; he is frequently disposed to moralise like an old man, on human vanity and the prospect of death. There is more art, at least more felicity in this, than may at first be imagined. For youth and old age are the two states of human life, capable of being placed in the most picturesque lights. Middle age

¹ Dissertation on the Poems of Ossian, by Hugh Blair, D. D.

is more general and vague ; and has fewer peculiar circumstances. And when any object is in a situation, that admits it to be rendered particular, and to be clothed with a variety of circumstances, it always stands out more clear and full in poetical description."

Ossian himself, uniting, in one person, the warrior and the bard, the father, the brother, and the son, is likewise a character of particular interest. His lamentation over his son, Oscar ; his attention to his brother, Fillan, when he goes to attend the movements of his enemy by night, and the consolations which he pours into his breast when he discovers him vanquished by Cathmor ; the respect and love which he entertains for his father, Fingal ; are all the beautiful traits of an amiable character.

The noble Cathmor is an enemy well worthy of the mighty Fingal. The first mention made of him in the poem is by the blood-thirsty and dark-designing Cairbair, when he is secretly plotting the murder of young Oscar at the feast. After he has ordered the bard to take " the harp, and bid Oscar to the feast," he adds: " Cathmor, my brother, is not here. He is not here with his thousands, and our arms are weak. Cathmor is a foe to strife at the feast. His soul is bright as that sun." Cairbair dreaded the approach of Cathmor, as he knew his generous soul would have revolted against so atrocious a deed. He is famed for hospitality to strangers ; but so delicate are his feelings, that he shuns the voice of praise. The generosity of his sentiments on the death of Fillan, and the struggle which he discovers between his love for Sulmalla, and his duty as the leader of his people, are the touches of a masterly painter. He had one foible, but it arose from an excess of virtue, he loved too fondly the gloomy Cairbair.

But Fillan,—a young warrior, commencing his career of military glory, lamenting his youth, which deprives him of leading the troops to battle, impetuous for fight, and panting for fame,—is a character which entwines itself round the heart of every reader ; and alone proves that the author of *Temora* was a poet of no mean genius, but an attentive observer of human nature, and one who knew well what strings to touch in order to fire and to melt the heart. How natural is his desire to engage the foe, on that night when he is sent out to watch their motions ! What can be more melting than that description of the emotions of his mind, when Fingal was appointing the general, who was to conduct the army to battle : " Bent over a distant stream he stood : the tear hung in his eye. He struck at times the thistle's head with his inverted spear." And can any thing be more sublime than the account of the last deeds, and of the fall of Fillan !

We must not pass Sulmalla over in silence. In her character are displayed some of the most interesting particulars in the life of

woman. Her ardent love for Cathmor, which prompted her, disguised as a warrior, to follow him to the field of battle—the description of the manner in which her soul was first filled with love of him—her song, as she sat beside Cathmor, unconscious of being perceived by him—the tender way in which she awakes, and advises him to shun the danger, when she hears the sound of the shield of Fingal, and then, her almost instantaneously bursting forth into a wish that he may gain renown in war, and return to her illumined with glory—delineate well the genuine qualities of the female character, always more sincere than that of man in its affections, and more vehement in its love. Virgil's Dido is likewise a master-piece of its kind, and is, as I think, the most finished character in the whole *Æneid*: but, as she was previously married, she does not appear in the simplicity, nor act with the delightful timidity of a young woman, who is burning with the pure flame of a first love. We might have expected that Lavinia would be almost the counterpart of Sulmalla; but she discovers little interest in the success either of *Æneas* or of *Turnus*, and is guided more by the rules of prudence, than by the artless dictates of nature. Such a character may be worthy of high commendation, but cannot be so well suited to excite lively interest, as one which is more simple and less prudent: the Lavinia of Virgil may, I think, be justly classed among that order of womankind, whom Sir Richard Steele has ingeniously called the “outrageously virtuous.”

The inferior actors in *Temora* are equally distinguished by peculiarity of character. Foldath is brave, imperious, overbearing, atrociously cruel, revengeful, and unrelenting. Hidalla is likewise brave, but his bravery is tempered with wisdom, and softened by humanity and gentleness; his speech is eloquent; his person elegant; and his countenance beams with serenity and mildness.

Besides human actors, an epic poet may introduce beings of a higher order, and these form, what has been termed, the machinery of the poem. It is by no means my intention to inquire whether this machinery be a beauty or a blemish in an epic poem; it is sufficient to consider whether Ossian, in the use of that of which he has made choice, has adhered to the rules of criticism; or, in other words, whether he has employed, naturally and at a proper season, the agency of supernatural beings. A poet, then, must be extremely temperate in the use of machinery, and so blend together the marvellous and the probable, as to remove from his poem the character of being entirely fictitious. If he be inattentive to this circumstance, very few readers will derive any degree of pleasure from his performance; for, we can feel no interest in perusing a number of fabulous stories, which, we are certain, could never possibly have occurred. To secure success in the effect of his machinery,

he must rest the foundation of it upon the popular belief and superstition of his country, and he is by no means entitled to fabricate any system of marvellous fables that he pleases, or even to incorporate into the poetry of one nation the fabulous creed of another. "Virgil and Homer," says Addison,¹ "might compliment their heroes by interweaving the actions of deities with their achievements; but for a Christian author to write on the pagan creed, to make Prince Eugene a favourite of Mars, or to carry on a correspondence between Bellona and the Marshal de Villars, would be downright puerility, and unpardonable in a poet that is past sixteen."

On examining the *Iliad* and the *Æneid* we shall find that such is the machinery of Homer and Virgil: the stories of the gods and goddesses, who so frequently interpose in behalf of their heroes, of Achilles, of Hector, and of Æneas, composed the religious belief of Greece and Rome; in these countries was to be found the outline, at least, of the mythology which the poets have perhaps embellished, and made more full and complete. Some critics, I know, have maintained an opposite opinion, and have contended that the machinery of Homer is entirely of his own invention; but the absurdity of such a supposition will, on a very slight consideration, become sufficiently apparent; for, not to say any thing of the incapacity of one man, how comprehensive soever his imagination might be, to invent so complicated a machine as the pagan theology, and that for the purpose of only embellishing a poem, let us imagine what effect a modern heroic poet would produce upon his heroes, if he were to introduce into his poem a complete mythology of his own invention, and were to interweave with the exploits of his heroes the actions of a number of gods and goddesses, who have been never before heard of, whose existence is unfounded on any tradition, and who are, in short, the creatures of his own wild fancy.

The machinery of Ossian consists of departed heroes, who are supposed to hover in the regions above, and to feel a lively interest in the actions of the friends, whom they have left on earth—to rejoice with them in their successes, and to mourn with them in their calamities. The history of ancient Scotland will fully prove how well adapted such a machinery must have been to the prejudices of the Highlanders, who are so notorious for their superstition. But his machinery is entitled to a higher praise. It is not merely the superstitious belief of one country, it is the belief of the world, it is now fostered in every inhabited spot of the universe, it commenced, and it is probable that it will end, with time.

¹ Spect. No. 523.

Ossian is also extremely correct in the use of his machinery; he never employs it unless with the greatest propriety, and on the most solemn occasions. In *Temora* we have only three ghosts: the first is that of Cairbair, which appears to warn Cathmor of his approaching death; the next is that of Fillan, which in these words rouses Fingal to battle—"Sleeps the husband of Clatho? Dwells the father of the Fallen in rest? Am I forgot in the fields of darkness; lonely in the season of night?" and the last is that of Cathmor, which, by its apparition, acquaints Sulmalla with the death of that hero.

I cannot in a better manner conclude my remarks on this subject, than by quoting the comparison which Dr. Blair has drawn between the merits of the machinery of Homer and that of Ossian. "Ossian's mythology is, to speak so, the mythology of human nature; for it is founded on what has been the popular belief in all ages and countries, and under all forms of religion, concerning the appearances of departed spirits. Homer's machinery is always lively and amusing; but far from being always supported with proper dignity. The indecent squabbles among his gods surely do no honour to epic poetry, whereas Ossian's machinery has dignity upon all occasions. It is indeed a dignity of the dark and awful kind, but this is proper, because coincident with the strain and spirit of the poetry. A light and gay mythology, like Homer's, would have been perfectly unsuitable to the subjects on which Ossian's genius was employed."

On a future occasion I shall view the machinery of Ossian in the light of ghosts, or the spirits of departed heroes, and trace the strong similarity which exists between them and those of Homer and Virgil.

Edinburgh, Nov. 1817.

LENNOX.

MISCELLANEA CLASSICA.

NO. II.—[Continued from No. XXX. p. 304.]

xxvi. THE use of Asia and Africa in the Roman writers, for the part of those continents subject to Roman jurisdiction, is analogous to our own use of America for the United States.

xxvii. Brunck, in his note on Soph. Œd. Tyr. 981, Πολλοὶ γὰρ ἦδη

κάν ὀνειράσιν βροτῶν, κ. τ. λ. cites a corresponding passage from Cic. de Divin. Suetonius, who is a great dealer in stories of that nature, mentions a similar dream of Cæsar's. (Vit. Cæs.)

xxviii. "The Flamen of Jupiter was an office of great dignity—but subjected to many restrictions; as, that he should not ride on a horse." Adams, Rom. Ant. p. 311, sixth edition. I know not whether it be worth mentioning, that a similar restriction, though originating in different motives, and enforced only by popular opinion, prevails with regard to the modern Popes. "Clement XIV. (Ganganelli,) was advised by his physicians to ride; he rode in the neighbourhood of his Alban Villa, and, it is said, offended the people of the country not a little by that supposed levity." Eustace, Classical Tour through Italy, Appendix, p. 389, third edition.

xxix. "A ship," says Lord Kaimes, speaking of the figurative expressions of the ancient Icelandic poetry, "is termed 'horse of the floods.'" Sketches of the History of Man, p. 156. The same metaphor occurs in Homer:

οὐδέ τί μιν χρεὼν
νηῶν ὠκυπέρων ἐπιβαίνεμεν, αἴθ' ἄλως ἵπποι
ἄνδρασι γίγνονται. Od. Δ. 707.

xxx. "The guests used sometimes, with the permission of the master of the feast, to put some part of their entertainment into their *mappa*, table-napkin, and give it to their slaves to carry home." Adams, Rom. Ant. p. 439. A custom resembling this prevails in our West India settlements. A guest, at an entertainment, makes a collection from the dessert, which he sends home to his family after the Roman fashion; and he who omits this necessary act of civility, is in danger of meeting with a cool reception on his return.

xxxi. "In after times, close attention was paid to the rearing of shady trees, aromatic plants, flowers, and evergreens; as myrtle, ivy, laurel, box-wood, &c. These, for the sake of ornament, were twisted, and cut into various figures, by slaves, trained for that purpose, called *Topiarii*." Adams, p. 531. The reader will recollect the descriptions in the Spectator, of a similar custom prevalent in England about the time of Queen Anne.

xxxii. The following are instances of variation in quantity among the Latin poets:

Gentes venere Sicanae. Virg.

Sicana procumbit pubes. Sil. Ital.

Duriusque Tagusque. Sil. Ital.

Roscis formosus Duria ripis. Claud.

Compulimus dirum Syphacem. Claud. — Syphacem is the common quantity.

xxxiii. There are a few lines in Homer, consisting exclusively of spondees.

Ψυχὴν κυκλήσκων Πατροκλῆος δειλοῖο. Il. Ψ. 221.

Σίτου καὶ κρεῶν ἥδ' οἶνου βεβρίθασιν. Od. O. 333.

Τὼ δ' ἐν Μεσσήνῃ. ξυμβλήτην ἀλλήλοῖν. Ib. Φ. 15.

Σείρην δὲ πλεκτὴν ἐξ αὐτοῦ πειρήναντες. Ib. X. 175. 192.

So in Ennius :

Olli respondit rex Albai Longai.

From which Virgil not improbably took his well-known—

Olli sedato respondit corde Latinus.

xxxiv. The Greek heroic poets use dactyls much more copiously than the Latin. The form of the hexameter, containing five dactyls, which is common in Homer, and sometimes occurs four or five times in succession, is not frequent in Virgil: there are only six or seven instances of its occurrence twice together. Nearly the reverse may be said of the line containing five spondees, which only appears once doubled in Homer (Il. H. 473, 474.) These observations, it is true, are of little importance; but they contribute to illustrate the genius of the two metrical systems.

xxxv. The Latin poets, at least from the Augustan age downwards, scarcely ever admit more than three elisions into their hexameter verses. The only instances I recollect of the contrary, are the following:

Is primam ante aciem, digna atque indigna relatu. Virg.

Nullane habes vitia? Imo alia, et fortasse minora. Hor.

Certatimque omnes uno ore, arma, arma requirunt. Ovid.

Lucretius is more free: we find in him a line containing five elisions, and another containing four in sequence:

Verum ubi equi atque hominis casu convenit imago.

Even this last is surpassed by a pentameter of Catullus:

Quam mihi, qui me unum atque unicum amicum habuit.

Our Cambridge readers will perhaps recollect “plurimaque hem hem atque hem hem.” Heinsius (de Contem. Mor. iv.) has ventured,

Circum acies fusa aligerum, atque exercitus omnis.

xxxvi. There are two lines in Homer, which, from the present manner of writing them, have a peculiarly inharmonious appearance, because a single word forms the third foot: something like the ruggedness of τοῦ μ' ἀνιστορεῖς νόμον πέρι;

Μάντι κακῶν, οὐ πάποτε μοι τὸ κρήγυνον εἶπας. Il. A. 106.

Ἡ οὐ μέμνη, ὅτι σ' ἐκρέμω ὑψόθεν, ἐκ δὲ ποδοῖν. Il. O. 18.

Such, at least, is the reading in all the editions I have noticed. Might not the harshness in question be removed, by writing οὐπω ποτε, and σε κρέμω?

xxxvii. In Il. X. 157—9, all the editions that I recollect read,

Τῇ ῥα παραδραμέτην, φεύγων, ὁ δ' ὀπισθε διώκων
πρόσθε μὲν ἐσθλὸς ἔφρευγε, δίωκε δὲ μιν μέγ' ἀμείνων
καρπαλίμως.

Perhaps it would be better to print the passage thus:

Τῇ ῥα παραδραμέτην, φεύγων, ὁ δ' ὀπισθε διώκων
(πρόσθε μὲν ἐσθλὸς ἔφρευγε, δίωκε δὲ μιν μέγ' ἀμείνων)
καρπαλίμως.

xxxviii. In answer to an argument brought against the hypothesis of Ἀτρείδης, Πηλείδης, &c. being trisyllables, because they never occur in such situations as to render it necessary that they should be

pronounced as trisyllables, it has been urged, that Homer scarcely ever places any word, consisting of three long syllables, in the collocation particularly alluded to (as in "jucundi meta soporis"), and that therefore, on this account alone, the words in question are inadmissible. Though the question is, doubtless, of little or no import to the main argument, it may be worth while to observe, that the result of a careful enumeration of the instances occurring in the Iliad, and a more cursory investigation of those in the Odyssey, discovered about fifteen or sixteen in the former, and four only in the latter. Many of these were formed by proper names, in which case some liberty might be allowed, or admitted of easy alteration: thus, Πατρόκλεες for Πατρόκλεις.

xxxix. The following example of a received form of expression among the Greeks occurs in the Institutes of Menu, as translated by Sir William Jones: "A son of a Brahmi, or wife by the first ceremony, redeems from sin, if he perform virtuous acts, ten ancestors, ten descendants, and himself, the twenty-first person.

xl. The expression ἀφείλετο, in Æsch. Pers. 434. (ἔως κελαινῆς νυκτὸς ὅμῃ ἀφείλετο), which has perplexed the commentators, occurs in a similar conjunction in Xen. Hel. 1. 2. 16. Ἀλκιβιάδης δὲ ἐδίδωκε—μέχρι σκότος ἀφείλετο.

xli. Adams explains the word antiquo, used in expressing dissent to a law, by "Antiqua probo," I like the old way. Perhaps the real derivation is from ante, or ἀντὶ, implying here opposition; as antica, a front gate, is derived from the same original.

xlii. A fine was imposed, at Lacedæmon, on those who omitted to marry within a certain age, by what was called ὀψιγαμίον δίκη. A similar tax, under the name of *æs uxorium*, was levied by the censors at Rome.

xliii. To the instances of metrical lines, adduced in No. xxix. of this Journal, add the following.

I. DEMOSTHENES.

ἢ τὸ παρὸν, τὴν τοῦ συμβούλου τάξιν ἀπαιτεῖ. De Cor. 57.

ὃ πᾶσι κοινόν ἐστιν ἀνθρώποις, ὅταν—ib. 59.

βλασφημίας ἅπασι, καὶ μάλιστα σοι. ib. 82.

πολλοὺς ἀπηγόρευε μὴ καλεῖν ἐμὲ—de Fals. Leg. 62.

II. ÆSCHINES.

Δημοσθένην

καὶ Κτησιφῶντα μάρτυρας ποιήσομαι. De Cor. 12.

εἰ χρὴ τὰ λοιπὰ τῇ πόλει καλῶς ἔχειν. ib. 45.

τις, ἄχθεμαι δὲ πολλάκις μεμνημένος—ib. 91.

μίαν δὲ νύκτα διαλιπὼν συνηγόρουν; de Fals. Leg. 23

πορεύεται Φίλιππος εἰς Πύλας, ἐγὼ—ib. 33.

καὶ κόσμος εἶναι τῆς πόλεως ἐφαίνετο—ib. 34.

ὄντων, καὶ σπονδὰς τοῖς σάμασιν αἰτησάντων. ib. 44.

III. THUCYDIDES.

τοὺς μὲν Ἀθηναίους ὅστις μὴ βούλεται οὕτω—vi. 26.

IV. CICERO.

Omnes autem ejus partes, atque omnia membra.—De Nat. Deor. i. 4

Nec audiendus ejus auditor Strato—ib. i. 13.

Numen Deorum comprobabimus? nihil—ii. 3.

Quorum neutrum astris contingere, propterea quod—ii. 16.

Atque hæc in bello plura et majora videntur—de Div. ii. 27.

Quod sequitur vero, non solum religionem—de Leg. ii. 2.

Qui secus faxit, Deus ipse vindex—Frag. xii. Tabularum apud Cic. de Leg. ii. 8.

xliv. It has been suggested, that the fragment of Sappho, ἦρος ἄγγελος, ἱμερόφρωνος ἀηδών, (Frag. lxxiii. Mus. Crit. No. I.) was originally a Sapphic line, standing thus: ἦρος ἄγγελ', ἱμερόφρων' ἀηδών.

xlv. In the Quarterly Review, (No. xxix. art. Barbary States,) a well-known trait of Grecian superstition is mentioned, as prevalent among the Moors of Barbary. "Among their superstitions may be reckoned—their abstaining from mentioning the word 'death,' which they avoid as cautiously as the courtly divine did the 'mention of hell to ears polite.'" There seems to be something of a similar *euphemism* among ourselves, when, by way of intimating the possibility of a particular person's dying, we say, "should any thing happen." In the "Tales of my Landlord," vol. i. a Scottish lord, one of the personages of the story, happening to mention in conversation the name of *fairies*, immediately recollects himself, and alters it to "gude folks," observing that the beings in question are liable to be offended when called by their proper name. This also reminds us of the *Eὐμήνιδες* of the Greeks.

xlvi. Since the article on the 24th Odyssey, in an earlier Number, was written, the author has met with a passage in Cowper's Letters, (Let. ccciii.) where that author mentions it as his opinion, that "except from the moment when the Ithacans begin to meditate an attack upon the cottage of Laertes, and thence to the end, the book is the work of Homer." "I believe perfectly," says he, "that, Homer himself alone excepted, the Greek poet never existed, who could have written the speeches made by the shade of Agamemnon, in which more insight into the human heart is discovered, than I ever saw in any other work, unless in Shakespeare." Might not, however, the characteristic parts of this passage be suggested by the conversation of Ulysses and Agamemnon in the 11th book?—"The battle," he adds, "with which the poem concludes, is, I think, a paltry battle, and there is a huddle in the management of it unworthy of my favourite, the favourite of all ages." The same thought had occurred to the writer of this article. The battle in question is such as might easily have been compiled from various parts of the Iliad: the interposition of Jupiter to prevent the continuance of warfare is a repetition of a similar incident in the 8th Iliad (l. 130. et seqq.) There are some passages in the 8th Odyssey, which seem scarcely worthy of Homer: it would be dangerous, however, to impeach the authenticity of these parts on such slender ground.

xlvii. Blomfield, Gloss. in Pers. 24, observes: "Regem Persarum

τὸν μέγαν βασιλέα (mallem μέγαν) audiisse, ut suum Fraucogalli dicebant *le Grand Monarque*, non opus est ut exemplis ostendam." I know not, however, whether this appellation was ever extended to any French king besides Louis XIV. Perhaps a more appropriate illustration would be the title Grand Signior, applied to the Emperor of Turkey, the Great King of more modern times.

xlvi. Gibbon, in the 58th chapter of his history, (vol. xi. p. 20, &c.) enumerates the temporal motives which appear to him to have united with enthusiasm in producing the first crusade: the acquisition of military glory and extensive dominion, the possession of the splendid palaces and boundless wealth of the east, the flavour of the Grecian wines, &c. Compare with this the actual topics of exhortation employed by Casimir, in some of his odes *De recuperando Orientis Imperio*, for the promotion of a new crusade against the Turks. The poetical disciple of Loyola is scarcely outdone by the sceptical historian. See also the opening of the seventh book of Camoens' *Lusiad*.

xlix. The following fragments of translation into Greek verse are submitted to the candour of the reader.

1. A Sole exoriente, supra Mæoti' paludes, ¹
Nemo est qui factis me æquiparare queat.

Epigr. in African. ap. Cic. Tusc. Disp. v. 17.

Διμνήν ἐς Μαιῆτιν, ἀπ' ἡελίου ἀνιόντος,
οὐδεὶς ἐστ', ὃς ἐμοὶ δύναται κλέος ἰσοφαρίζειν.

2. Cuju' ipse princeps jurisjurandi fuit,
Quod omnes scitis, solus neglexit fidem:
Furere assimilavit; ne coiret, institit.
Quod ni Palamedis perspicax prudentia
Istius percipiet malitiosam audaciam,
Fide sacratæ jus perpetuo falleret.

Fragm. ap. Cic. de Off. iii. 26.

Οὐπερ γὰρ ὄρκου πρῶτος ἦν ἐπιστάτης,
ὥς ἴστε πάντες, οἷος αὐτ' ἐψεύσατο,
μανίαν προτείνων· πάντα δ', ὥς μὴ ξυμπλέοι,
ἐμήσατ'. εἰ δὲ μὴ σφε Παλαμῆδους νόος
κακόφρονα τόλμαν εὔρε μηχανώμενον,
ἧ μὴν ἐς αἰεὶ τὴν καθιερωμένην
ἔψευσε πίστιν.

3. Oui, je viens dans son temple adorer l'Eternel:
Je viens, selon l'usage antique et solennel,
Célébrer avec vous la fameuse journée
Où sur le Mont Sina la loi nous fut donnée.
Que les temps sont changés! &c. Racine, *Athalie*, init.

¹ Davies, from a various reading, suggests, "Mæotidas usque paludes." Perhaps the passage ought to be read, "Mæotis adusque paludes." Claud. de Phoen. Et Pelusiacas productus adusque paludes. One reading of the passage in Cicero is, "adusque Mæotis paludes."

Εὖ τοι κάτοιδας· εἰμι γὰρ τὸν ἄφθιτον
 λιταῖσι τέρψων, ἐν δόμοις αὐτοῦ, Θεόν·
 ἡμάρ τε κλεινὸν κεῖν', ὅτ' ἐν Σίνης πτυχαῖς
 ὁ Θεῖος ἡμῖν ἐξεκηρύχθη νόμας,
 τιμῇ παλαίᾳ κεῦσεβει περιστελῶν.
 φεῦ τῆς ταχείας κάθεαυ μεταλλαγῆς· κ. τ. λ.

4. Celui qui met un frein à la fureur des flots,
 Sait aussi des méchans arrêter les complots.
 Soumis avec respect à sa volonté sainte,
 Je crains Dieu, cher Abner, et n'ai point d'autre crainte.
 Ib. Act. i. Sc. 1.

ᾠ φίλτατ', ἀλλ' ὅς κυμάτων πολὺν ψόφον
 στεβρῶνταῖσιν ἐντολαῖσι κοιμίζειν σθένει,
 κακῶν μάλ' οἶδε μηχανὰς ἀναστρέφειν.
 τούτου δ' ἐγὼ ἀγνὴν εὖ σέβων βουλὴν, Θεὸν
 δέδοικ', Ἀβνηρῆς, ἄλλο δ' οὐ δέδοικά τι.

CÆCILIVS METELLVS.

DE L'IMPROVISATION POETIQUE

*Chez les Anciens, et particulièrement chez les Grecs et
 les Romains.*

PAR M. RAOUL-ROCHETTE.

Troisième Partie.

SECTION PREMIERE.

De l'Improvisation chez les Grecs.

J'AI désapprouvé la témérité de quelques assertions de M. Wolf, destituées de toute autre autorité que de la sienne; et peut-être le zèle qui m'anime pour les vrais intérêts de la critique exigeoit-il de moi cette libre profession de mes sentimens envers ces hardis novateurs, qui, substituant partout leurs idées particulières aux plus graves témoignages de l'antiquité; n'estimant dans les auteurs que ce qui favorise leurs opinions, et condamnant sans scrupule tout ce qui les contrarie; rejetant comme entièrement invraisemblable ce qui n'offre pas à leurs yeux tous les caractères réunis de la vraisemblance, veulent soumettre les faits eux-mêmes à l'examen de leur raison, mesurer les degrés de la probabilité d'après ceux de leur intelligence, et renfermer le cercle entier des évènements possibles dans les bornes étroites de leurs connoissances.

Cette méthode, que font profession de suivre tant de philosophes de nos jours, n'est certainement pas la plus philosophique; et quant à moi, je préfère le doute modeste des hommes véritablement éclairés, à l'ignorance présomptueuse des demi-savans. On pourra me taxer de crédulité, parce que j'ai pris tous les moyens d'assurer ma croyance : mais on ne me réduira jamais à chercher la vérité des faits anciens dans les opinions de nos raisonneurs modernes, et à ne reconnoître d'autre autorité sur ces matières que les décisions arbitraires de leur jugement.

Que mes lecteurs excusent une digression, qui n'étoit sans doute pas déplacée, et qui peut-être ne sera pas inutile. Je reviens encore à M. Wolf; mais ce sera, cette fois, pour me ranger à son avis. Il prétend que non-seulement Homère ne savoit pas écrire, mais encore que l'écriture étoit ignorée de son temps;¹ et j'avoue qu'il est difficile de refuser son assentiment aux preuves qui justifient une opinion, qui n'étoit sous la plume éloquente de Rousseau qu'un ingénieux paradoxe, et dont la critique savante de M. Wolf a fait une vérité démontrée. Avant que l'usage des caractères propres à exprimer la pensée fût devenu populaire dans la Grèce, c'étoit à la mémoire seule qu'étoient confiées les œuvres du génie. Des hommes, en qui l'exercice avoit fortifié cette faculté naturelle, apprennent aisément de longs fragmens de poèmes et des poèmes entiers, qu'ils déclamoient ensuite dans les assemblées de la nation; et c'est de cette manière que les productions poétiques se perpétuoient en passant de bouche en bouche jusqu'aux générations les plus éloignées. Cette prodigieuse capacité de la mémoire ne nous surprendra pas sans doute, si nous réfléchissons que, chez les Tartares, peuple étranger à la culture des lettres, on conservoit ainsi par le souvenir seul et par une tradition orale, d'immenses séries de vers qui comprenoient les généalogies de leurs princes et les annales de leur nation depuis un grand nombre de siècles,² et que les Italiens modernes, même ceux qui par leur naissance ou leur éducation sont le moins familiers avec la lecture des poètes, possèdent dans leur mémoire et déclament alternativement de vive voix les poèmes de l'Arioste et du Tasse, dont ils amusent souvent pendant des journées entières les loisirs de la populace.⁴

Dans la Grèce à peine civilisée, la conservation des ouvrages des poètes faisoit une grave et importante occupation, et une espèce de profession particulière pour les hommes appelés *rhapsodes*.

¹ Prolegom. ad Homer. § xviii. p. 73.

² Œuvres Posthumes, tom. xvi. p. 240, edit. Genev. 1782.

³ Voy. de semblables exemples rapportés dans les Prolegomènes de M. Wolf.

⁴ Voy. le récit que fait Madame de Staël, des amusemens de Venise (Corinae, liv. xv. c. 8. tom. iii. p. 76—77.)

Leur art avoit dû prendre naissance en même temps que le talent des poètes, dont ils étoient les organes immédiats, avoit commencé à briller de quelque éclat. Aussi la profession des rhapsodes paroît-elle remonter à une haute antiquité, quoique leur nom, postérieur à Homère, soit d'une époque assez moderne; et M. Wolf, qui, pour établir l'existence ancienne de cet art,¹ rappelle le titre de *rhapsode* appliqué à Hésiode,² auroit dû ne pas omettre le témoignage plus formel et plus décisif de Platon, qui donne le même titre au poète Phémios d'Ithaque.³ Les observations que j'ai faites plus haut, sur la nature et le caractère du talent de ce poète, peuvent s'appliquer à tous ceux du même temps et de la même profession, tels que *Chæris*, de Corcyre, et *Automède*, de Mycènes;⁴ et il est, en effet, probable que ces rhapsodes, contemporains de Phémios, et ceux même du siècle qui succéda immédiatement à celui-là, étoient la plupart, ainsi que lui, des poètes improvisateurs. L'idée que Platon nous donne de ces anciens rhapsodes, confirme entièrement notre conjecture. Pour réussir dans leur art, il ne leur falloit pas moins d'inspiration qu'aux poètes eux-mêmes, ou plutôt, leur art n'étoit qu'une inspiration continuelle.⁵ L'enthousiasme qui agitoit les poètes et leur dictoit des chants sublimes, se communiquoit par une impulsion rapide aux rhapsodes qui leur servoient d'interprètes; et c'est-là, selon Platon, cette chaîne de personnages tous saisis d'un souffle divin, dont les poètes formoient le premier anneau, et dont les chaînons s'étendoient jusqu'aux derniers spectateurs par l'intermédiaire des rhapsodes.

Plus tard, et lorsque les moyens de donner de la publicité aux œuvres du génie furent devenus plus communs, l'art des rhapsodes, en perdant son premier usage, sembla acquérir une extension nouvelle, et se perfectionna d'autant plus, qu'il étoit devenu moins nécessaire. Comme il offroit la ressource de publier les productions poétiques avec plus de promptitude et d'éclat tout à la fois, comme l'effet que produisoient ces ouvrages étoit plus brillant et plus rapide, lorsque, communiqués au peuple par l'organe des rhapsodes, accompagnés d'une déclamation animée, et soutenus

¹ Prolegom. ad Homer. § xxiii. p. 99.

² Athen. lib. xiv. p. 620. ed. Casaubon.

³ Plato, in Ion. tom. iv. p. 534.

⁴ Demetrius Phaler. apud Isac. Tzetz. Prolegom. ad Cassand. Démétrius est le seul auteur, à ma connoissance, qui fasse mention de *Chæris*. Eustathe (ad Odys. lib. iii. p. 1466, lin. 56) parle d'*Automède*, et ajoute que ce poète étoit de Mycènes, qu'il avoit composé en vers le récit du combat d'*Amphitryon* contre les *Téléboëns*, et de la querelle de *Cythéron* et d'*Hélicon*. Il dit encore que, selon la conjecture de quelques critiques, cet *Automède* étoit le même poète qu'*Homère* avoit désigné comme gardien de *Clytemnestre*.

⁵ Plato, loc. laud., ἵστί γὰρ τοῦτο τέχνη μὲν οὐκ ὄν παρά σοι, ... θεία δὲ δύναμις ἡ σε κίνη.

du charme de la mélodie, ils échappaient ainsi aux lenteurs inséparables de l'écriture et au jugement sévère du cabinet; les poètes préférèrent toujours une voie si naturelle et si commode de jouir du fruit de leurs travaux: aussi les vit-on fréquemment réunir la double qualité d'auteur et de rhapsode; et les exempls de Xénophane,¹ de Téspandre,² de Cinxthus,³ et de mille autres, justifient suffisamment l'assertion de M. Wolf, que presque tous les rhapsodes de cette espèce furent en même temps des poètes recommandables.⁴

Il nous reste peu de documens sur la manière dont ces rhapsodes déclamaient leurs propres poésies et celles des autres auteurs. Ce qui est certain, c'est qu'ils les débitaient de mémoire, et en s'accompagnant sur des instrumens.⁵ L'enthousiasme qui s'emparait d'eux, dans un débit doublement animé par l'harmonie poétique et par le rythme musical, devoit donner à cette déclamation rapide l'air d'une composition improvisée; et il est probable que, pénétrés eux-mêmes de tous les sentimens qu'ils exprimoient, échauffés par la peinture des passions dont ils étoient les organes, et saisis, comme nous les représente Platon, du délire poétique qui avoit inspiré leur auteur, et qui transportoit leur auditoire, ces rhapsodes ne se bornoient pas toujours au rôle passif d'interprètes. Ici, la vraisemblance seule doit suffire, au défaut des témoignages qui nous manquent; et l'on ne pourroit, sans en blesser toutes les règles, supposer que ces hommes, doués pour la plupart de la faculté de produire eux-mêmes des chants poétiques, familiarisés par une longue habitude avec la langue des vers, demeuraient si scrupuleusement fidèles à leur mémoire, lorsqu'il leur étoit si facile de s'abandonner à l'impulsion de leur génie; lorsqu'en débitant une œuvre étrangère, et, à plus forte raison, en récitant leurs propres ouvrages, ils trouvoient de si fréquentes occasions, d'expliquer ce qui étoit obscur, de développer ce qui n'étoit qu'indiqué dans la composition originale, de réunir plusieurs morceaux séparés en les liant par des transitions imprévues, de captiver enfin la bienveillance de leurs auditeurs par quelques allusions flatteuses.⁶

¹ Diogen. Laert. lib. ix. c. 18.

² Plutarch. de Musica, § iii.

³ Scholiast. Pindar. ad Nem. ii. v. 2.

⁴ Prolegomen. ad Homer. § xxiii. p. 99.

⁵ C'est ce que prouve l'exemple de Phémios et de Démodocus dans Homère. On a beaucoup écrit sur l'art des Rhapsodes; mais on n'a encore éclairé que bien peu de choses. Les critiques les plus modernes qui ont traité cette matière, M. Drésig (in Comment. Lyps. 1734) et M. Gillies (History of Greece, vol. i. c. 6.) laissent beaucoup à désirer. M. Wolf, qui n'a pas moins d'érudition, et qui a plus de sagacité, me paroît le plus satisfaisant (voy. les Prolegomènes, passim); et cependant, il s'en faut bien qu'il dissipe toutes les obscurités.

⁶ Je n'ai fait que traduire ici les propres expressions de M. Wolf et développer sa pensée (Prolegomen. § xxv. p. 105.)

C'est aux fréquentes altérations commises par les rhapsodes dans la chaleur d'un débit rapide, que les critiques anciens attribuoient les innombrables variantes des poèmes d'Homère :¹ telle est indubitablement la source de toutes les interpolations qu'on y remarqua long-temps avant l'établissement de l'école d'Alexandrie, et qui firent douter dès-lors, comme quelques personnes doutent encore aujourd'hui, si le texte d'Homère, qui nous est parvenu, est bien le texte original de ce poète. Il est certain que toute l'école du rhapsode Cinxthus, qui exerçoit avec éclat son art dans la LIX^e Olympiade, fut accusée d'avoir dénaturé les poèmes d'Homère de plusieurs manières, et, entre autres, en y insérant de nombreuses suites de vers qui ne lui appartenoient pas ; et l'on ne sauroit nier que ces altérations, même indépendantes de la volonté du rhapsode, n'aient dû se reproduire encore plus fréquemment à l'égard des ouvrages dont le mérite moins généralement reconnu, et la réputation moins solidement établie, permettoient au rhapsode de se donner plus de carrière et de suivre plus librement l'inspiration de son génie.

Souvent aussi les rhapsodes se bernoient à faire précéder leurs déclamations, d'exordes préparatoires ou *préludes*, dont le sujet étoit relatif soit aux poèmes qu'ils alloient réciter, soit aux circonstances particulières, dans lesquelles ils se trouvoient. Ces exordes n'étoient encore, et le plus ordinairement, que de courtes invocations aux Dieux ; on les nommoit *proèmes*, et ils étoient tantôt écrits, tantôt improvisés, ainsi que le fait conjecturer la nature même de ces poésies, et que semble l'indiquer le témoignage d'un ancien.² Tespandre se distingua dans ce genre de composition, et il y employa le vers héroïque,³ le plus sévère et le plus difficile de tous ; ce qui n'empêcha pas, sans doute, que des rhapsodes moins habiles ne se servissent quelquefois d'une mesure

¹ Telle étoit l'opinion des critiques d'Alexandrie (Vid. apud Joseph. contr. Apion. lib. i. c. 2, p. 439.)

² Plutarch. de Music. § vi. Le dernier éditeur de Plutarque, M. Hütten, pense (tom. xiv. p. 215) avec M. Wyténbach que les mots *ὡς βοῦδονται* ne font ici aucun sens, et qu'ils doivent être reportés dans la phrase supérieure. M. Burette (Académ. des Inscriptions. tom. x. p. 234) ne les a pas traduits, sans doute parce qu'il ne les comprenoit pas. Pour moi, je crois pouvoir défendre la leçon du texte, avec l'interprétation que je lui donne.

³ Plutarch. ibidem, § iv. Le mot de *προίμια* indique le premier usage qu'on fit de ces poèmes. Le scholiaste de Thucydide le fait dériver (ad lib. iii. c. 104.) de *αἶμα* chant, étymologie infiniment plus probable que celle du scholiaste d'Eschyle (ad Septem advers. Theb. v. 1.), qui la tire de *αἶμα* route, parce que, dit-il, on chantoit ces vers sur les grands chemins. Dans la suite, le mot *προίμια* servit à désigner des hymnes entiers (Pindar. Nem. ii. v. 3.), tels que ceux que l'antiquité elle-même attribuoit à Homère (Thucyd. lib. iii. c. 104) ; et l'opinion de quelques critiques, que ces hymnes furent composés des proèmes débités par les rhapsodes, peut n'être pas dénuée de fondement (cf. Wolf, Prolegomen. § xxv. p. 107 ; Micscherl. ad Hymn. ad Cérér. p. 101 ; Gródzick, Comment. de Hymn

moins rigoureuse. Comment, en effet, dans le cours d'une improvisation rapide, se seroient-ils assujétis à la régularité pénible du même mètre, lorsque des compositions étudiées offroient l'exemple commode du mélange de tous les mètres? Un grammairien avoit remarqué que dans le *Margitès*, poème attribué à Homère, les vers iambiques étoient jetés pêle-mêle parmi les héroïques,¹ sans ordre et sans symétrie. Un autre critique reprochoit à Homère d'avoir pris de semblables licences et de plus graves encore, non-seulement dans ce *Margitès*, poème du genre badin, mais même dans des compositions d'un genre plus sévère et d'un caractère plus élevé, telles que l'Iliade et l'Odyssée.² Athénée observe que les fréquentes irrégularités qui se rencontrent dans la versification des poésies d'Homère, étoient favorables au chant;³ et l'on ne peut douter que plusieurs poètes, qui trouvoient plus facile, sous ce prétexte, d'imiter ses défauts, que d'atteindre à ses beautés, n'aient pris depuis une licence qu'un pareil exemple avoit consacrée. Aristote cite⁴ d'un certain *Chéramon* un ouvrage, qu'il appelle une *rhapsodie composée de toutes sortes de mètres*. De pareilles fautes, à moins qu'elles ne proviennent de la bizarrerie d'un système particulier, ne sauroient se concilier avec le travail d'une composition réfléchie; les ouvrages où elles se trouvoient, devoient donc par cela même être plutôt considérés comme les fruits de l'inspiration, que comme ceux de l'étude, et l'on sent quelle facilité pouvoit donner aux improvisateurs cette permission d'employer indistinctement tous les mètres, comme ils jouissoient de la faculté de composer leur diction de tous les dialectes.

Tant que les poètes [et les rhapsodes] ignorèrent ou négligèrent l'usage de l'écriture, et que, dans les récitations publiques qui se faisoient de leurs productions communes, on ne sépara point la poésie de la musique, il est probable que, pour remplir les diverses obligations qui leur étoient prescrites, et pour varier eux-mêmes leurs succès, ils appelèrent souvent l'inspiration au défaut de la mémoire. Les anciens ne connurent long-temps que le mot *aoidos*, *chantre*, pour désigner un *poète*; et cette expression, dont l'usage

relig. Homer. p. 21). Ces proèmes étoient encore appelés *προαίλια*, ou *προνόμια*, selon qu'ils étoient destinés à être chantés sur la flûte, ou à précéder des *nomes* (Burette, Académ. des Inscript. tom. x. p. 235). Dans ce dernier cas, il paroît qu'on doit les assimiler aux *ἐπαρχεῖα* qui formoient, selon Pollux, (Onomast. lib. iv. c. ix. § 65) la première des sept parties du *nome*.

¹ Hephæstion, de Metris: οἷός ἐστιν ὁ Μαργίτης ὁ εἰς Ὅμηρον ἀνειφρόμενος· ἐν ᾧ παρασπάρται τοῖς ἑπείσιν ἰαμβικά, καὶ ταῦτα οὐ κατ' ἴσον σύστημα.

² Marius Victorin. lib. i, colon. 2512, edit. Hanov. 1605: "Homerus... non tantum in duobus corpusculis Iliados et Odysseæ, versibus teliambris frequenter est usus: sed et in eo carmine, cui Margites nomen est, idem herois hexametris trimetros iambicos tanquam pares numero miscuit."

³ Athen. Deipnosoph. lib. xiv.

⁴ Aristot. de Poëtic. cap. 1.: μικτὴν βαρβόαν ἐξ ἀπάντων τῶν μέτρων.

paroît avoir été bien postérieur aux siècles d'Homère et d'Hésiode,¹ renferme en elle-même l'idée du travail et de l'étude, qui étoit étrangère aux premiers chantres de la Grèce, et incompatible avec leur profession. Aussi, ne ferai-je point de difficulté de ranger dans cette classe d'improvisateurs, la plupart des anciens poètes prédécesseurs ou contemporains d'Homère.² J'ai déjà eu occasion de nommer plusieurs de ces poètes, et je vais en indiquer quelques autres, sur lesquels nous aurons encore à regretter que l'antiquité, qui n'avoit recueilli d'autre monument de leur existence littéraire que leurs noms et les titres de leurs ouvrages, ne nous ait transmis que des détails fabuleux et incomplets.

La période qui précéda le siège de Troie, vit fleurir Amphion, Linus, Anthès, Musée, Piérus, Philammon, Thamyris, Orphée : la plupart de ces poètes ne sont guère connus aujourd'hui que par des traditions mythologiques. Amphion fut l'inventeur d'un genre de poésies qui se chantoient sur la cithare :³ on citoit, dans l'antiquité, des *hymnes* de sa composition,⁴ et les prodiges de sa lyre ont été célébrés dans tous les temps.⁵ Linus avoit composé des *chants plaintifs*, et un poème sur *la création du monde*, dont le premier vers est cité par un ancien,⁶ et dont des fragmens plus étendus sont rapportés par un autre :⁷ ces vers n'avoient pu être conservés que par la tradition, puisque, selon des témoignages formels,⁸ Linus n'avoit rien écrit. Nous ne connoissons même pas d'une manière aussi imparfaite les *hymnes* d'Anthès, et le poème de Piérus sur *les Muses*.⁹ La même obscurité couvre les productions de l'antique Musée, dont l'une avoit pour objet les *traitemens des maladies* ;¹⁰ sujet en apparence peu favorable à la poësie, mais

¹ Sur l'usage vulgaire du mot poète, voy. Platon (Sympos. p. 205, c. ed. Stephan. cf. Wolf. Prolegom. § xii. p. 42.)

² C'étoit aussi l'opinion de l'Abbé Arnaud (Œuvres complètes, tom. ii. p. 100) et de son ami, M. Suard (Mélanges de Littérature, tom. iii.) " Il ne nous seroit pas difficile de démontrer qu'en effet les anciens poètes de la Grèce étoient tous improvisateurs." Je veux bien croire que cela n'étoit pas *difficile à démontrer*. Mais, en tout cas, il étoit encore moins difficile de le dire. Quant à moi, je n'ose pas me flatter d'avoir *démontré*. J'ai donné quelques preuves, j'ai fourni plusieurs probabilités. Tout cela suffira peut-être pour rendre mon sentiment vraisemblable, mais non pas pour faire partager ma conviction à tous mes lecteurs.

³ Heraclid. apud Plutarch. de Music. § iii.

⁴ Philostrat. vit. Sophist. lib. ii. § xxvii. c. 4. p. 618. ed. Olear.

⁵ Pausan. lib. ix. c. 5 ; Maxim. Tyr. Dissertat. xxi. p. 218 ; Palæphat. c. xlii, et alii.

⁶ Diogen. Laërt. lib. i. § 4.

⁷ Stob. Eclog. Physic. c. xiii.

⁸ Pausan. lib. ix. c. 29 ; Origen contra Cels. lib. i. p. 14.

⁹ Heraclid. loc. suprà laud.

¹⁰ Eustath. in Prolegomen. Homer.

utile à l'humanité, et, sous ce rapport, digne d'exercer les talens de Musée. La destinée de Philammon et de Thamyris fut plus brillante, sans que celle de leurs ouvrages ait été plus heureuse. Le premier, dont l'âge n'est établi que sur une généalogie très-douteuse,¹ mais dont la haute antiquité n'est pas moins certaine,² célébra, dans des vers qu'il chantoit agréablement sur la lyre, la naissance d'Apollon et de Diane;³ il fut le premier qui institua des chœurs de musique et de danse dans le temple de Delphes,⁴ et le second qui remporta le prix de poésie aux jeux Pythiques.⁵ Thamyris fit un poëme sur la guerre des Titans;⁶ il avoit, en outre, composé une *Cosmogonie*, en cinq mille vers,⁷ une *Théogonie*, en trois mille.⁸ il excella surtout dans les *hymnes*,⁹ et ce fut par un poëme de ce genre, en l'honneur d'Apollon, qu'il remporta, immédiatement après Philammon, le prix de poésie des jeux Pythiques.¹⁰ Pour Orphée, il est suffisamment connu, et je ne m'arrêterai point à en parler.

Le second âge de la poésie Grecque, l'emporte de beaucoup, en raison du progrès des mœurs et des lumières, sur celui qui l'avoit précédé. On y remarque, il est vrai, une foule de versificateurs médiocres; et les noms obscurs de Palamède,¹¹ d'Orceban-tius, de Trézène,¹² de Mélisandre, de Milet,¹³ de Sisyphe, de Cos,¹⁴ du Crétois Dictys,¹⁵ du Phrygien Darès,¹⁶ de Syagrus,¹⁷ de Corinnus,¹⁸ de Pamphus,¹⁹ d'Olen,²⁰ d'Abaris,²¹ de l'Athénien Palæ-

¹ Cf. Hygin. Fabul. cc; Ovid. Metamorph. lib. ii. v. 270—301; Scholiast. anonym. Homer. ad Odys. xix. 432; Suidas, v. Φιλάμμων.

² Tatién (Orat. ad Græc. p. 136 et 139, ed. Oxon.) le range parmi les poëtes prédécesseurs d'Homère; et selon le Scholiaste d'Apollonius de Rhodes (ad Argonaut. lib. i. v. 23), il accompagna les Argonautes.

³ Heraclid. apud Plutarch. de Music. § 111.

⁴ Idem, ibidem.

⁵ Pausan. lib. x. c. 7.

⁶ Heraclid. ibidem.

⁷ Tzetzes, Chiliad. vii. Histor. 108.

⁸ Suidas, v. Θάμυρις.

⁹ Plato, de Legib. lib. viii. et de Republic. lib. x.

¹⁰ Pausan. lib. x. c. 7.

¹¹ Suidas, v. Παλαμήδης.

¹² Ælian. Histor. var. lib. xi. c. 2.

¹³ Idem, ibidem.

¹⁴ Tzetzes, Chiliad. v. Histor. 29.

¹⁵ Idem. Chiliad. v. Histor. 30.

¹⁶ Ælian. Histor. var. lib. xi. c. 2.

¹⁷ Idem, ibidem, lib. xiv. c. 21, et Eustath. in Prolegomen. Homer.

¹⁸ Suidas, v. Κόρινθος.

¹⁹ Pausan. lib. vii. p. 577, lib. ix. p. 762.

²⁰ Pausan. lib. x. c. 5.

²¹ Herodot. lib. iv. c. 35, et alii.

phat,¹ ont à peine échappé à l'oubli dont leurs productions ont été frappées. Mais cet âge produisit HESIODE, dont on répète encore aujourd'hui les chants harmonieux, et HOMERE, qui fut toujours sans rivaux, comme il avoit été sans modèles. Quelques femmes, dans le cours de ces deux périodes, essayèrent aussi d'associer leurs noms à la gloire de ces chantres célèbres. Les antiques Sibylles Daphné² et Phémonoé³ exprimèrent dignement en vers les volontés des Dieux dont elles étoient les organes; une Corinne, de *Thespie*, que l'identité de nom et de patrie ne sauroit faire confondre avec la rivale de Pindare,⁴ consacra ses talens au même usage; et l'on cite encore une Aristomaque, d'*Erythres*, dont les poésies furent couronnées aux jeux Isthmiques.⁵

Les poèmes qui nous sont parvenus sous le nom d'HESIODE, ne paroissent être ni de la même main, ni de la même époque. Les *Ouvres et les Jours* offrent seuls des caractères d'antiquité trop frappans et trop nombreux, pour que l'authenticité en puisse être révoquée en doute. La *Théogonie* a certainement souffert de graves altérations, et le *Bouclier d'Hercule*, ainsi que la plupart des *fragmens* qui nous restent des autres poésies d'Hésiode, attestent, par leur diction même, la différence de l'âge et du génie de leur auteur.⁶ L'idée qu'Hésiode cherche à nous donner de son talent répond bien à celle que nous nous sommes formée du talent des autres poètes de la même période : *ce sont les muses elles-mêmes qui dictent ses vers; les chants émanés de sa bouche ne sont point le fruit de l'étude, mais l'effet d'une inspiration spontanée; c'est un délire prophétique qui l'anime et qui dévoile à ses yeux le passé et l'avenir.*⁷

Que n'a-t-on pas dit d'HOMERE, et quel éloge reste-t-il encore à faire de ses poésies? La gloire de leur auteur, loin de vieillir en traversant tant de siècles, a semblé briller d'un nouvel éclat à chaque époque nouvelle; et l'admiration, ce sentiment qui se fatigue si aisément et si vite, a paru pour lui seul inépuisable dans ses expressions, comme immortelle dans sa durée.⁸ La destinée

¹ Suidas, v. Παλαίφατος.

² Diodor. Sicul. lib. iv. c. 66.

³ Elias Cretens. apud Gregor. Nazianz. Orat. iii. in Julian.

⁴ Suidas, v. Κόρινθα.

⁵ Plutarch. Sympos. lib. v. quæst. 2; cf. Olear. Dissertat. de Poëtriis Græcis, p. 130, ed. Wolf.

⁶ Wolf, Prolegomen. ad Homer. § xii. p. 42, not. 9.

⁷ Hesiod. Theogon. v. 24—35; vid. Lucian. Dialog. cum Hesiod. tom. viii. p. 147. et seqq., ed. Bipont.; Scaliger, Poëtic. lib. i. c. 2, p. 11.

⁸ Je me plais à rappeler ici le magnifique portrait que l'Abbé Barthélemy a fait d'Homère, dans son Introduction au Voyage du Jeune Anacharsis. Je n'ai vu nulle part le caractère du génie de ce grand poète exprimé avec plus de vérité et

de cet homme extraordinaire eut quelque chose de semblable à celle des Dieux qu'il consacra dans ses vers. Une obscurité mystérieuse couvrit leur naissance et la cacha aux yeux mêmes de ceux qui leur dressaient des autels et qui leur offroient des hommages. La Grèce recueillit les fruits de son génie, sans pouvoir jamais retrouver les titres de son existence. On ne lui connoissoit point de famille ; il ne laissa point de postérité.¹ Son tombeau même fut, comme sa patrie, un sujet de disputes qui ne sont pas encore éteintes,² et, s'il n'eût pas chanté, on ignoreroit qu'il eut vécu. Tant de nuages répandus sur une vie qui dut être si brillante, ont fait douter long-temps de l'authenticité des poésies d'Homère, ainsi que de l'existence de leur auteur. Mais, si je ne puis partager la première de ces opinions, il m'est encore plus impossible d'approuver la seconde. Des traditions confuses ou mensongères ont pu obscurcir la vérité, sans la détruire ; et, bien qu'il faille nous résoudre à ignorer les principales circonstances de la vie d'Homère, je ne crois pas que nous puissions raisonnablement la révoquer en doute, ni que la juste défiance que nous inspirent ces traditions contradictoires, doive s'étendre jusque sur le caractère de talent qu'elles supposent ou qu'elles attribuent à l'auteur de l'Iliade.

L'idée que nous y puisons d'Homère, et qui s'accorde avec celle qu'il nous donne lui-même de Phémios et de Démodocus, est celle d'un poète improvisateur. L'un des plus doctes commentateurs, qui avoient pris à tâche de recueillir toutes les notions éparses concernant ce grand homme, affirme,³ qu'*Homère respiroit en quelque sorte les vers, tant le langage poétique lui étoit devenu familier, et qu'il s'exprimoit en vers avec plus de facilité et de grâce que personne ne pouvoit le faire en prose.* Il entre sans doute de l'exagération dans cet éloge ; mais il faut bien que la vérité en ait fourni la matière ; le mensonge eût été trop grossier, pour qu'aucun homme de sens eût voulu le croire ou

d'élégance, pas même dans le livre, estimable d'ailleurs, que l'Anglois Wood a composé exprès sur ce sujet (*An Essay on the Original Genius of Homer*, 1775).

¹ C'est à tort, en effet, qu'on a regardé les Homérides de Chios, dont il est fait si fréquemment mention chez les auteurs anciens (Plato, in *Tone*; Isocrat. in *Helen*. *Encom.* § 28; Strabo, *Geograph.* lib. xiv. p. 645, et alii), comme des descendants de ce poète. C'étoit une école de rhapsodes qui prenoient pour texte habituel de leurs déclamations, des morceaux empreints d'Homère ; telle est l'opinion très-vraisemblable de M. Wolf (*Prolegomen.* § xxiii. p. 98, not. 65), qui ne prend même pas la peine de réfuter celle de Leo Allatius (de *Patriâ Homer.* c. xiii). et je conviens avec lui que les passages rapportés dans Harpocraton (v. *Ὀμηρίδαι*) ne la détruisent nullement : elle est d'ailleurs partagée, et, par conséquent confirmée, par M. Coray (ad Isocrat. tom. ii. p. 336—337).

² Voy. surtout le traité précédemment cité de l'Allacei (apud *Antiq. Græc.* tom. x. p. 1719—1852).

³ Eustath. in *Prolegomen.* *Homer.* : Καὶ ὅτι ἔπνευ τὰ ἔπη Ὀμηρος, καὶ οὕτως εἶχε τῆς περιέργου καὶ ἐμμελοῦς μάσης, ὡς ὁδὸν τοῦ ἐν ἀπλότῃ πεζολογίῳ ἔτεροι.

le répéter, et l'on ne ment pas ordinairement en pure perte. D'ailleurs, la *Vie d'Homère* attribuée à Hérodote¹ prouve, par une foule de faits, que cette faculté merveilleuse fut réellement possédée par Homère; et l'on n'invente pas des faits de cette nature, uniquement pour soutenir une opinion bizarre. Je sais que cette *Vie d'Homère* a paru supposée à de savans critiques, quoiqu'elle ait eu assez généralement cours dans l'antiquité sous le nom d'Hérodote; mais je pense, et en cela, du moins, mon opinion ne manque pas d'autorité,³ que c'est s'abuser grossièrement que de voir dans cet ouvrage la production d'un siècle barbare. J'y reconnois, au contraire, le goût et l'esprit de la saine antiquité; et je n'hésite point à regarder cette vie, de quelque main qu'elle ait été écrite, comme le recueil le plus ancien des traditions les plus fidèles concernant la personne et les ouvrages d'Homère.

Or, de quelle manière y est-il représenté? Nous l'y voyons sans cesse errant de ville en ville, et débitant partout des vers analogues aux circonstances qui les lui inspiroient. On me permettra sans doute de rapporter ici quelques-unes de ces pièces, qu'on pourroit nommer *fugitives* avec beaucoup plus de vérité, que la plupart de nos poésies modernes. Outre qu'elles serviront à prouver l'improvisation qui les produisit, elles portent en elles-mêmes un degré d'intérêt, qui doit en rendre la lecture agréable à tous les amateurs de l'antiquité. Je me servirai de la traduction de M. Larcher, qui n'est peut-être pas très-poétique, mais dont la naïve fidélité me paroît avoir assez bien conservé le caractère de l'original.

Dans un séjour qu'Homère avoit fait à Cumes, il y avoit, en plusieurs occasions, captivé les suffrages des citoyens par la récitation de ses poèmes. Enhardi par les éloges donnés à son génie, et flatté de l'accueil dont sa personne étoit l'objet, il proposa aux magistrats de consacrer ses talens à l'illustration de leur ville, pourvu qu'ils voulussent le nourrir aux frais du trésor public. Cette demande, quoique fortement appuyée par les principaux citoyens, fut cependant rejetée d'après les observations de l'Archonte; et, lorsqu'on vint lui apprendre le résultat fâcheux d'une

¹ Tatian. advers. Græc. c. 48; Suidas, v. *Ὅμηρος*; Eustath. in Prolegomén. Homeric. et alii.

² Voy. les auteurs cités plus haut. Le docte Fabricius a cru ne devoir prendre aucun parti dans cette question littéraire. M. le Président Bouhier, auteur des savantes Recherches et Dissertations sur Hérodote, a été moins timide; et son sentiment, que je suis tenté de partager, malgré l'autorité de Wettersing, est que cette vie d'Homère est véritablement d'Hérodote, mais un ouvrage de sa jeunesse, et une espèce d'essai.

³ Voy. ce que dit à ce sujet M. Larcher (tom. vi. not. 25, p. 199—200 de sa nouv. édit. de la Traduction Française d'Hérodote.)

délibération dont il devoit se promettre une plus heureuse issue, Homère, saisi d'indignation et de douleur, exprima ses sentimens dans des vers prononcés au moment même :¹

“ A quelle destinée fatale le père Jupiter a-t-il permis que je fusse en proie, moi qui ai été nourri délicatement sur les genoux d'une mère respectable, dans le temps que les peuples du Phricium, habiles à dompter les chevaux et ne respirant que la guerre, élevèrent, sur les bords de la mer par l'ordre du Maître des Dieux, la ville Cotienue, la magnifique Smyrne, que traversent les eaux sacrées du Melès ! Les doctes filles de Jupiter vouloient, en partant de ces lieux, immortaliser par mes vers la ville illustre de Cumes. Mais, sourds à ma voix, ses habitans insensés ont dédaigné mes chants harmonieux. Non, non, il n'en sera pas ainsi : quiconque, dans sa folie, aura accumulé les outrages sur ma tête innocente, ne l'aura pas fait impunément. Je supporterai courageusement le sort auquel le Dieu m'a condamné dès ma naissance. C'en est fait ; je ne demeurerai plus à Cumes ; mes pieds brûlent d'en sortir, et mon grand cœur me presse de me rendre dans une terre étrangère.”

Dans son voyage de Phocée à Chios, Homère obtint des navigateurs, qui faisoient voile pour Erythres, de monter sur leur vaisseau ; et à peine y avoit-il pris place, que, pour leur en témoigner sa reconnaissance, il proféra de suite cette invocation à Neptune :²

“ Soyez favorable à mes vœux, puissant Neptune, qui réglez sur les vastes campagnes d'Hélèce ; envoyez-nous un vent favorable ; accordez à ces navigateurs compagnons de mon voyage, et au maître du vaisseau qui me porte, un heureux retour dans leur patrie. Puissé-je aborder bientôt au pied du sourcilieux Mimas ! puisse-je y rencontrer des hommes justes et pieux, et me venger de celui qui, par ses trahisons, a irrité Jupiter hospitalier, et qui, m'admettant à sa table, a violé en ma personne l'hospitalité.”

Pendant le cours de la même traversée, Homère n'éprouva pas toujours la même bienveillance de la part des hommes de cette profession. Des pêcheurs, qui appareilloient pour l'île de Chios, refusèrent, malgré ses instantes supplications, de le prendre sur leur bord ; et le Poète les menaça d'une navigation malheureuse, dans ces vers prophétiques qui lui furent inspirés par la colère :³

“ Navigateurs, qui traversez ces mers, vous qui, toujours en butte aux traits du malheur, et, tels que les timides plongeurs,

¹ Vit. Homer. § xiv.

² Ibidem, § xvii.

³ Ibidem, § xix

tirez de cet élément perfide une subsistance pénible, respectez l'auguste Jupiter, protecteur et vengeur des droits de l'hospitalité. Sa colère est terrible; craignez qu'elle n'éclate sur la tête de ceux qui l'offensent."

Homère, toujours errant et malheureux, avait trouvé un asile dans la cabane d'un pauvre pasteur. Tandis qu'il y réparait ses forces par un repas frugal, les chiens, fidèles gardiens du troupeau, ne cessoient d'aboyer après l'étranger, lorsque celui-ci adressa au berger ces vers, dont la diction est aussi simple que le sujet, et qui ne contenoient qu'un conseil relatif à la circonstance :

"Glaucus, pasteur de ce troupeau, mettez-vous dans l'esprit ce que je vais vous dire. Donnez à manger à vos chiens, sur le seuil de votre cabane. Ce conseil vous sera avantageux, ils entendront plus facilement l'approche d'un homme ou celle d'une bête qui dirigera sa marche vers le parc où est renfermé votre troupeau."

Une autre fois, des potiers de terre, qui connoissoient son talent pour la poésie, l'invitèrent à entrer chez eux et à leur réciter des vers, s'engageant à lui donner, pour prix de cette complaisance, quelques-uns de leurs vases, ou tout autre objet qui lui seroit plus agréable. Il n'en fallut pas davantage pour exciter son génie, et sur le champ il leur adressa une pièce de vers, la plus longue de toutes celles du même genre qui nous sont parvenues sous son nom, et dont toutes les expressions aussi bien que toutes les idées attestent qu'elle fut pareillement improvisée :

"Potiers, si vous m'accordez la récompense promise, je vous chanterai ces vers. Accourez à ma voix, Pallas, protégez ce fourneau. Que tous les cotyles, que toutes les corbeilles se couvrent d'un beau noir et soient cuits à propos. Qu'ils rapportent à leur maître un prix considérable. Qu'il s'en vende beaucoup au marché, beaucoup dans les rues. Que le profit en soit grand. Puissiez-vous, Déesse, m'accorder de croître ainsi en sagesse!—mais, si, sans pudeur, vous cherchez à me tromper, j'invoque contre votre fourneau toutes les pestes qui portent à votre art les coups les plus funestes. Que le fourneau, que la maison soient la proie des flammes; que, dans le trouble occasionné par l'incendie, on n'entende que les gémissemens et les cris plaintifs des potiers. Tel le

¹ Vit. Homer. § xxii.

² Vit. Homer. § xxxii. Cette pièce étoit connue dans l'antiquité sous le titre du *Fourneau*, κλίμης; cependant, elle est citée dans Pollux (Onomast. lib. x. segment. 85, p. 1255) sous le nom des *Potiers*, κεραμῆς. Voy. à ce sujet la note de M. Hemsterhuis.

frémissement du cheval ; tel soit celui du fourneau, lorsque les vases voleront en éclats. Fille du Soleil, Circé, célèbre par vos enchantemens, répandez vos poisons sur les potiers et sur leurs ouvrages. Et vous aussi, Chiron, amenez avec vous grand nombre de Centaures, et ceux qui ont échappé aux coups d'Hercule, et ceux qui ont péri en combattant contre lui. Puissent-ils briser tous ces ouvrages ! puisse le fourneau tomber sous leurs coups, et les potiers, en se lamentant, être témoins de cet affreux spectacle ! Je me réjouirai cependant de leur calamité. Quiconque se baissera pour contempler de plus près cet incendie, qu'il ait le visage consumé par les flammes, afin que tout le monde apprenne à ne point commettre d'injustice."

Enfin, car il seroit trop long de rapporter tous les morceaux du même genre que le même auteur attribue à Homère, et qui furent prononcés dans des circonstances semblables,¹ ce poète se trouvant à Samos, fut invité à un banquet public donné pour la fête nationale des *Apaturies*. Arrivé au lieu du festin, il s'arrêta sur le seuil de la porte, et, tandis qu'on allumoit le feu dans la salle, il prononça de suite ces vers :²

" Un homme s'enorgueillit de ses enfans ; une ville de ses remparts ; une campagne de ses chevaux ; la mer des vaisseaux qui la couvrent. Les richesses sont l'ornement d'une maison ; de respectables magistrats, assis sur un tribunal, offrent un tableau majestueux. Mais le plus agréable spectacle, à mon avis, est celui du feu qui brille dans une maison, un jour d'hiver, lorsque le fils de Saturne répand sur la terre la neige avec les frimats."

Tous ces exemples me paroissent démontrer incontestablement, surtout après les témoignages précédemment allégués, qu'Homère possédoit au plus haut degré la faculté d'improviser, et que cette faculté étoit autant dans les mœurs générales de son siècle, que dans la nature particulière de son génie. Mais je me garderai bien de conclure de là que les poèmes qui nous sont restés sous son nom, et ceux même d'une étendue moins considérable que l'antiquité lui attribue, comme la *Petite Iliade*, la

¹ Entre autres, § xx.

² Vit. Homer. § xxxi. Le même impromptu est aussi rapporté par l'auteur anonyme du *Combat poétique entre Homère et Hésiode* (apud Barnes. Prolegomen. ad Homer. p. 28.), qui fait quelques légers changemens au texte de ces vers et aux circonstances de ce récit. J'observe que, dans ce dernier passage, l'auteur emploie le mot *σχεδιάζων*, qui signifie proprement improviser.

Phocride,¹ l'expédition d'Amphiaraiüs,² les Cercopes, les Epichlides,³ et quelques autres peut-être dont on a négligé de nous transmettre les titres ; que ces poëmes, dis-je, aient été produits par l'improvisation. C'est faute d'avoir fait une distinction si importante, que l'Abbé Arnaud s'est vu conduit à cette assertion, au moins fort hasardée,⁴ que les vers d'Homère, ces vers qu'ont admiré et qu'admireront tous les âges, Homère les enfantait sur le champ, sans peine, sans efforts, comme une source répand ses ondes. Cette image est ingénieuse ; mais, appliquée à toutes les productions d'Homère, elle manque certainement de justesse. L'art qui règne dans la composition de *l'Iliade* et de *l'Odyssée*, atteste une étude trop profonde et trop réfléchie ; toutes les parties en sont trop bien liées au sujet principal, et trop exactement proportionnées entre elles ; la diction même, comme le tissu de la fable, offre une suite trop uniforme des plus savantes combinaisons, pour que nous puissions y reconnoître l'œuvre téméraire de plusieurs inspirations instantanées. Ce n'est qu'après de longues méditations, qu'Homère a pu produire ces deux grands monumens de l'esprit humain, que tous les siècles ont admiré ; le temps ne les a sans doute respectés, que parce qu'ils furent en partie son ouvrage, et c'est, à mon avis, la plus forte de toutes les absurdités littéraires qui nous sont venues d'Allemagne, que de regarder comme un recueil fait au hazard de divers poëmes écrits par différens auteurs,⁵ ces compositions immortelles qu'un seul homme put créer, puisque l'antiquité n'en connut jamais deux qui fussent capables de les produire. Mais cette perpétuelle application d'Homère, jointe au génie le plus heureux, lui procura sans doute la faculté d'exprimer en vers, au gré des circonstances, les sentimens et les pensées qu'elles devoient naturellement lui suggérer. Son imagination vive et féconde put s'exercer sans préparation et sans effort sur des sujets, pour lesquels elle eût toujours été trop tardive et par conséquent superflue. Trop riche des trésors de sa veine, pour n'en être pas un peu prodigue, il put se livrer aux saillies de l'inspiration, sans craindre d'en tarir la source, et ces jeux d'une muse facile, qui s'enrichit de ses pertes et s'embellit de ses négligences, ajoutoient à la réputation du poëte, sans diminuer de son mérite.

¹ Vit. Homer. § xvi.

² Ibidem, § ix.

³ Ibidem, § xxiv.

⁴ Œuvres Complètes, tom. ii. p. 100.

⁵ Voy. une note de M. Larcher, tom. vi. p. 191—192.

ANSWER

To the "Observations on Mr. ROBERTS's Reply to Sir W. DRUMMOND, in Classical Journal, Nos. XXVII—XXVIII."

THOUGH I thought I had given no occasion for any attack from your correspondent F. R. S., it appears from No. XXVIII. of your Journal that I have been mistaken; and considering the singularity that his communications on the subject exhibit, I cannot be much surprised at it.

With something more than warmth in his own expressions, and less than candour, he appears to expect a candid confession in my cooler judgment from me. He makes researches for *canons of perspicuity* in writings in which no intimation was given that such *canons*, if any such there be, were to be found. Knowing, as he says, how to treat the memory of Mr. Bryant with a gratefully cherished *respect*, he thinks proper to make it a part of his observations, that Mr. Bryant *could trifle*. I am sure however he did not trifle with the truth.

In his attack on Sir W. D. your correspondent F. R. S. very magnanimously presented the abridgment, to which he added some remarks which provoked a reply. Towards that reply, for three years he observes a most respectful silence—makes no attempt to vindicate either the Scriptures, Mr. Bryant, or himself. At last, when an effort had been made to defend the cause, which F. R. S. had deserted, he attacks the one who did make the effort, and censures him for assuming what he found in the reply, as to two circumstances of very little consequence to the principal subject, as correct, which F. R. S. had so long left uncontradicted. If it was at all necessary to contradict them, was it not so in the first instance; or was it necessary to see the answer from another before he could defend himself even so far? However this may be, had there not been that neglect on his part, he would have had no reason for the complaint he has made in terms not the most gracious, and in a mode not very consistent in itself.

Translating my expressions and sentiments into others more convenient for attributing a bad intention, and exaggerating the cause of complaint, he says, "I could not help remarking (in this, indeed, the writer has himself anticipated me) that he has been guilty of the very offence which he attributes to

his adversary." This is not my language, nor are the ideas mine. I attributed to the haste only, with which the reply evidently appeared to be written, that which I presumed the consulting the original work of Mr. Bryant, and at more leisure, might have been obviated; and I objected to the authority of an abridgment, particularly to one so described, because it is of the very nature of an abridgment to omit much, and it may therefore omit what may be of consequence in a discussion, though not otherwise. A doubt therefore must necessarily arise as to an abridgment's being sufficient authority in a discussion. As to any thing in the nature of a simple extract or reference, the same *necessity* for a doubt does not exist; on the contrary, a general appearance of fairness precludes suspicion, and the more decisively, if a mistake can be, and is not rectified by him whom it most concerns to do it. The cases therefore are, I apprehend, so far from being *the same*, that they are very different; nor did I anticipate any farther than saying I had not read the abridgment. My attention was limited to what was before me; nor did I think it necessary to extend it, for I had no doubt as to its fairness, and saw no reason to doubt it.

Again, it is alleged that, as to the *asinine* part of the subject, "with a little trouble" I "might have gone on assured grounds." I would here beg leave to ask whether, if any trouble was to be taken, F. R. S. was not the most proper person to take it in his own defence, having had time enough to do so. But it seems that, for want of taking this trouble, I have "been constrained to argue hypothetically." Why then, if he was not to blame, how does it affect him? Surely his withers are unwrung, by whatever I may have said, arguing abstractedly. Yet, when he objects to my arguing hypothetically, is it very consistent to allow himself to found a charge of *perverseness* on *presumed ideas* of his own? It does not at least come well from him who made the objection, to say thus; "With the means *presumptively* quite within his reach—(for, as a reader of the *Classical Journal*, he has *probably* access to all its Numbers) he *has* disdained, or neglected to turn to No. XII.—and has thus been constrained to argue hypothetically and conjecturally where he might *perhaps*, with a little trouble, have gone upon assured ground." Here we have *presumptively*, *probably* and *perhaps* convoked and lending their aid to form an accusation; but as their aid may be called in on either part, it may also be in candour said, *per contra*, that *presumptively* Mr. R. *had not* the means within his reach, or he would have made such use of them as might not have been disserviceable to his purpose.—*Probably*, as he did not make that use of them, he *had not* then access to all the Numbers of the *Classical Journal*. *Perhaps*

therefore there was neither neglect nor disdain in the affair. With the three last probabilities, I may add, F. R. S. would himself have really "gone on assured ground;" and I now hope to make it apparent that the motive of perverseness, attributed to me, is the very reverse of that which ought to have been so attributed.

In the expectation that F. R. S. would, as it was incumbent on him to do, reply to Sir W. D., for the first year I did not write a line, to the best of my recollection, on the subject, as I thought it due to F. R. S. not to anticipate him. In the second year I did write on the subject; but, from the same motive, waited till the third was at its close, when I sent my reply (which I might have done the year before) for the insertion with which you honored it, for then I thought it in vain to expect any reply from F. R. S. to Sir W. D. Had I seen the abridgment, I should have had no expectation of the kind. The first Number of your Journal that I took in was the 14th. Its merit has induced me to continue it. I have, however, as F. R. S. had laid so much stress on the 12th Number, procured it, and in my turn will only observe, that when he gives Hebrew words in his communications to the public, he would do well to avail himself of the assistance of one who understands the Hebrew language: he might then go on assured grounds as to *it* with little trouble. That he has given the words of Mr. Bryant as to Petra correctly I should have some pleasure in acknowledging, had the appeal been unaccompanied by a groundless and unjust reflection. I call it both; for I can sincerely affirm that, in whatsoever I have offered to the public, I have in no respect asserted what I did not, when I wrote, believe to be correct and well founded: neither have I been unwilling to correct an error, if I perceived it; or spared myself in any respect, where any means, in my power to attain, seemed necessary in order to ascertain the truth. In the present instance the silence of your correspondent was the very motive to my belief that he could not contradict any part of what was urged against him. To a liberal mind it would be more congenial to presume that a misapprehension might be accidental, unless it could be proved otherwise. But this could hardly be expected, when your correspondent's wrath does not spare even Mr. Bryant, who was not to blame if the abridgment did not produce the effect expected. I will only suggest to him that very good advice was given by the Wise Man, who has said, "Of a friend become not an enemy."

Oswestry, Nov. 1817.

P. ROBERTS.

E. H. BARKERI AMENITATES CRITICÆ ET PHILOLOGICÆ.

PARS II.—[Fide NO. XXXI. p. 109.]

* *OPRZION*.¹ In *Novo Thes. Gr. L.* Fasc. ii. p. cccxli. a. ubi agitur de v. *Ὀρυζα*, nulla deminutivi *ὀρύζιον* mentio facta est. Extat autem in Comment. in Dionys. Thracem ap. Bekk. Anecd. Gr. T. ii. p. 794. *Ὀριζα*, *ὀρίζιον*. Lege, *Ὀρυζα*, *ὀρύζιον*, ut legitur in Bastii apographo ap. Schæfer. ad Gregor. Cor. p. 28.

OPINΔΗΣ. De hoc vocabulo vide *Nov. Thes. Gr. L.* Fasc. ii. p. cccxli. Adde e Phrynichi Arab. Σοφ. Προπαρ. ap. Bekk. Anecd. Gr. T. i. p. 54. * *Ὀρίνδα* ἦν οἱ πολλοὶ ὀρυζαν καλοῦσιν, ubi nota *Ὀρίνδα*, non, ut ap. Hesych. J. Poll. vi. 73. et Atheni. iii. p. 110. e., *Ὀρίνδης*.

ΟΞΕΤΗΜΙΑ. De hac voce fuse actum est in *Novo Thes. Gr. L.* Fasc. iii. p. 199. a. 204. n. 2. 211. a. et n. 2. “Versus Eupolidis ap. Harpocr. in quibus emendandis operam fere perdidit Vales. p. 141. ita constitues :

Ὁν χρῆν ἐν τε ταῖς τριόδοις κὰν τοῖς ὀξυθυμίοις

Προστρόπαιον τῆς πόλεως καίεσθαι τετριγότα.

Metrum idem est quo utitur Aristoph. in parabasi Nub. 518. quoque usum esse Eupolidem constat e loco ap. Schol. ad v. 540. et 552.” Porsoni Advers. p. 286=253. Plura de hoc metro ap. ipsum Porsonum vide.

ARISTÆNETUS, i. 15. Σὲ δὲ, ᾧ πασῶν ὑπερφέρουσα γυναικῶν καὶ κάλλει καὶ γνώμῃ, τῆς εὐφρονος οὐ παρήγαγεν εὐβουλίας οὐχ ὄρμος, οὐχ ἐλικτῆρες, οὐ πόλεων τὸ πολύτιμον. “Tollius, τῶν λίθων : Pauw. ψελίων : V. D. ap. Dorvill. Crit. Vann. p. 608., πλοκίων : Triller, Obs. Crit. p. 34., οὐ πῶλων, vel οὐκ ἐμπολέων τὸ πολύτιμον, Non venditorum et institorum pretiosissimum.” Abresch. “Cum Aristæneti loco omnino conferendus est locus Aristoph. ἐν Θεσμοφ. B. qui legitur in J. Poll. vii. 95. et Clem. Alex. Pædag. ii. p. 245. ed. Potter., ἀμφιδέας, ὄρμους, πέδας, Σφραγίδας, ἀλύσεις, δακτυλίους, καταπλάσματα, Πομφόλυγας, ἀποδέσμους, ὀλίσβους, σάρδια, Ὑποδερίδας, ἐλικτῆρας. Unde in Aristæneto, similem forte ordinem sequente, emendandum censemus, Οὐχ ὄρμος, οὐχ ἐλικτῆρες, οὐ πεδῶν τὸ πολύτιμον. Clem. Alex. l. c. p. 244. 22., Πέδας δὲ * περισφυρίους τὴν περὶ τοὺς πόδας ἀκοσμίαν τῶν γυναικῶν, Φιλήμων ἐν Συνε-

¹ Voces asterisco notatæ in H. Stephani Thes. desiderantur.

φίβω προσεῖπεν· ἱμάτια διαφαίνοντα καὶ πέδη τινὰ χρυσῆν." Editores *Novi Thes. Gr. L.* p. 175. n. In hac conjectura facienda praevit Koen. ad Gregor. Cor. p. 523. :—"Pauw. ψελίων conjiciebat, s. ψελίων, quæ sunt L. i. Ep. 4. Alii alias conjecturas proposuerunt : ὄφρων, Pierson. ad Moer. p. 288. Sua se simplicitate commendabit, Οὐ πεδῶν τὸ πολύτιμον. Inter mundum muliebrem Poll. vii. 96. refert ὄρμους, πέδας, et ἐλικτήρας. Χρυσαὶ πέδαι sunt in Philostr. Ep. xl." Addit Bastius hæc :—"Cod. Vindob. unicus Aristæneti, perinde ut edd. habet οὐ πόλεων τὸ πολύτιμον. Corrupta vox πόλεων quomodo corrigenda sit, non ausim pro certo dicere. Etenim vitii in πολ latentis non ea, opinor, origo est, ut paleographiæ scientia viam muniat ad verum detegendum : siquidem e voce, quæ statim sequitur, πολύτιμον, illa ratione natum esse puto, quam supra p. 418. satis declarare memini. Koenii quidem conjectura, πεδῶν, non caret probabilitate. Græco cuidam, cui locum Epistolographi Vindobonæ ostenderam, placebat legere περονῶν s. πορπῶν, fibularum. Pollux l. c. Περὸνας, ἀμφιδέας, ὄρμους, πέδας." * ἈΒΡΟΠΟΥΣ, * ἈΚΡΟΠΟΥΣ, * ἘΛΑΦΡΟΠΟΥΣ. Vide *Nov. Thes. Gr. L.* Fasc. ii. p. 43. n. 1. et iii. p. 50. a. "In Epigr. ἀδ. DXXI. * Λεσβίης, ἀβροπόδων βήμαθ' ἐλίσσόμεναι Brunckio et Jacobsio vulgata lectio satis ridet, ἀβροπόδων scilicet dicto ex eleganti poetarum usu pro ἀβρῶν ποδῶν, cum Schæfero et Schneidero unice probanda videatur correctio, ἀβρὰ ποδῶν. At ἀβροπόδων satis tuetur hic Pausaniæ locus, qui legitur in L. ii. c. 4. Τὸ δὲ ἄγαλμα τοῦτο ξόανόν ἐστι, πρόσωπόν τε καὶ χεῖρες καὶ ἀκρόποδες εἰσι λευκοῦ λίθου. Si enim ἀκρόποδες Græce dici potest pro ἄκροι πόδες, cur non Epigrammatographo ἀβρόποδες usurpare liceat pro ἀβροὶ πόδες, parum intelligimus. Sed et ex versu quodam ap. Dionys. H. de Comp. Verb. xxv. p. 390. ed. Schæf. hæc lectio firmari potest, Κοῦραι ἐλαφροπόδων ἔχνε' αἰεζάμεναι, ubi Schæf. edidit, ἐλαφρὰ ποδῶν. Sed ἐλαφραπόδων tenent Codd. Reg. i. et Colb. 'Dedi,' inquit Schæf., 'diremtis vocibus, ἐλαφρὰ ποδῶν. Ἐλαφρόπους Scottus in solo hoc Rhetoris loco reperit.' At poetæ forsan liberum fuit ἐλαφρόπους e Gr. linguae genio dicere pro ἐλαφρὸς πούς, etiamsi ipse hoc compositum sibi finxisset." Editores *Novi Thes. Gr. L.* Fasc. iii. p. 318. n. C. A. Lobeckio, qui humaniter mihi usum concessit Observationum suarum in Phrynichi Ecl. nondum editarum, longe aliter visum est. "Jam dudum Schneider. in Lex.," inquit vir eruditissimus, "ἀβρὰ ποδῶν corrigendum esse vidit. Nihilo melius est ἀκρόπους pro ἄκρος πούς, quod Schneider. citat e Pausan. (l. c.) Rectius hic, opinor, τὸν ἀκρόποδα e Palladii Comm. in Hippocr. L. i. de Fract. 285. B T. vii. Chart. p. 210. sect. 6. Foes. adtulisset : quanquam ne hoc quidem dubio caret, quum idem scriptor τὸν ἄκρον πόδα dicere soleat ; sed de hoc non magnopere reluctabor, propter quas diximus causas. Pausaniam vero quum

videam semper eodem modo loquutum esse, ἄκροι πόδες, vi. 19. 201. viii. 31. 451. coll. ii. 11. 220. vii. 23. 322. viii. 25. 425. ix. 4. 13. haud satis intelligo, cur in hoc uno loco a consuetudine recesserit." Quod ad Pausaniæ locum attinet, recte statuit Lobeck. non solum propter rationem adductam, sed et quoniam prosaico scriptori non licuit ἀκρόπους pro ἄκρος πούς usurpare. Ἀκρόπους enim, si unquam in Gr. lingua extaret, poetis solis concedendum esset. At ἀβροπόδων in Epigr. satis tueri videtur versus ille, Dionys. Halic. nobis servatus, in quo Codices ἐλαφροπόδων exhibent, pro ἐλαφροπόδων. Mirum sane esset, si librariorum incuria illic ἀβροπόδων pro ἀβρὰ ποδῶν, hic autem ἐλαφροπόδων pro ἐλαφρὰ ποδῶν scriptum esset.

* ΛΩΤΟΦΑΓΙΑ, ΛΩΤΟΦΑΓΙΤΙΣ, * ΛΩΤΟΦΑΓΙΣ s. * ΛΩΤΟΦΟΡΟΣ νῆσος. "Stephanus," ut scripsi in Amœnitatum harum parte prima (Class. Journ. xxxi. p. 116.), "insulam Λωτοφόρον vocari tradit; Strabo Λωτοφαγίτιν. Bodæus p. 326. a. e Strabone Theophrasto restituebat, Τῇ νήσῳ τῇ Λωτοφαγίτιδι, sed nihil mutandum; Schol. enim Platonis habet, Παρὰ τὴν Λωτοφαγίαν νῆσον." In alio articulo, cui titulum dedi, "On the Originality of Kuster's Discovery about the true Force of the Middle Verb," (Class. Journ. xxx. p. 309.) hæc addidi:—"For the words of the Scholiast, Καὶ παρὰ τὴν Λωτοφαγίαν νῆσον, ἀνέχουσιν τῆς χώρας, Petr. Olaus Brondstedt (in Bredowii Epistt. Paris. p. 139.) would read, Καὶ παρὰ τὴν Λωτοφαγίδα νῆσον ἀπέχουσιν τῆς χώρας. Surely for Λωτοφαγίδα he either wrote, or meant to write Λωτοφαγίτιδα, as in Strabo p. 834. Συνεχῆς δ' ἐστὶν ἡ μικρὰ Σύρτις, ἣν καὶ Λωτοφαγίτιν Σύρτιν λέγουσι. I have l. c. observed that this island is by Theophrastus called Λωτοφαγία, and that the accuracy of that reading, which Bodæus seems inclined to dispute, is placed beyond doubt by its being found in the Scholiast also. As to the other emendation ἀπέχουσιν, there can be no doubt of its correctness, as it is supported both by the obvious sense of the passage, and by the received text of Theophrastus." Fons emendationis utriusque Brondstedtianæ petendus esse videtur in Bastii Comment. Paleogr. p. 747.:—"Alpha et Ny legentes interdum confuderunt, quando litera impositam habens lineolam minus distincte scripta omninoque (ut e. c. A et Δ) ad errores gignendos prona esset. Sic in Schol. Plat. p. 186. ediderunt, Καὶ παρὰ τὴν Λωτοφαγίαν νῆσον, ἀνέχουσιν τῆς χώρας κ.τ. λ. Sed Cod. 1807. unde hoc Scholium sumtum est, dat Λωτοφαγίδα. Vid. Tab. iii. num. 10. Porro pro Ἀνέχουσιν ex eod. Cod. scribendum Ἀπέχουσιν. In unciali scriptura tachygraphorum Π facile habeas tam pro N, quam pro H." Sed virum doctum vocem Λωτοφαγίδα non suspectam habuisse, impense miror. Λωτοφαγίς enim e Gr. linguæ genio a Λωτοφάγος formari non potest. Λωτοφάγος ὁ, non Λωτοφαγίς ἡ, sed Λωτοφαγίτις, quod ostendit Strabonis locus. Scribe igitur meo periculo in Schol. Platon.

Ἀωτοφαγίτιδα, neque aliter in Theophrasto legendam : Ἀωτοφαγία enim, ut in hoc scriptore editum est, nusquam alibi occurrit.

Obiter moneo mihi in notando Schneideri errore de versu quodam Alcmænis, vide Excerpta ex Arcadio Grammatico Ms. in Class. Journ. xxx. p. 312. n., prævisse, ut tandem aliquando percepi, Bast. quem vide ad Gregor. Cor. p. 575.

E. H. BARKER.

Thetfordiæ, Dec. 1817.

REMARKS

On the Introductory Chapters of Moses.

No. I.

IN perusing the introductory chapters of Moses, some remarks occur to me which have escaped all the commentators, and which may seem worthy of a place in the *Classical Journal*.

In order fully to understand an ancient writer, it is absolutely necessary to have a complete view of the circumstances in which he was placed; and if this be true of all former authors, it must be particularly so in regard to the Jewish legislator, whose situation was so peculiar, and so remote from the apprehension of modern readers. Moses flourished in an age, in which false philosophy was taught, and Atheism systematically supported by men who cherished against the chosen people, and against Jehovah himself, all the insolence of national hatred, all the bigotry of polytheism, and all the subtleties of superior pretended wisdom. While the philosophers endeavoured to account for the formation of the world by vain hypotheses, or by natural causes, it was the leading object of Moses to assign the creation and government of the universe to one Intelligent Being, as its only real cause: and with this proposition he sets out, "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth," as though he had said, "Other men who know not the true God, attempt to account for the world by saying that it is eternal, or that it began to exist by chance, or that its phenomena originated in natural causes by no means the appointment of a su-

preme intelligence : but these theories are all vain, false, and absurd. The world, when it began to exist, existed by the will and operation of God alone." And to guard his readers against the conclusion so generally insisted upon by the Antitheistic teachers, that the Creator was not a rational, conscious being, distinct from the works of nature, he hints that he was *spiritual*: "And the *spirit* of God moved on the face of the waters," that is, "God, who is a spirit, and not the same in nature with the heavens and the earth."

Moreover, in order to impress on his readers a clear conception and a firm conviction of the existence of a Supreme Intelligent Principle, distinct from the works of his hands, he represents him not only as a creator when producing the world, but as a *sovereign* surveying the materials upon which he was going to work, calling them forth into existence by his mere will, and then examining, and approving of them as good. "And the spirit of God moved (i. e. put himself in motion to survey the great abyss) along the surface of the waters : and God said, let there be light, and there was light : and God saw the light that it was good." And this representation is continued again and again in the sequel, till the whole work is finished.

Moses, in holding forth God as a sovereign, was naturally led to adopt the language, which a king usually adopts when, in reference perhaps to his counsellors or ministers, he calls himself *we*, though intending to designate no other than his own individual person, "And God said, let *us* make man in our image, and *our* likeness, and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowls of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth."

The connexion clearly points out in what the image of God, after which man was made, consisted. It was the dominion which the universal sovereign gave him over the works of his hand. God made him king over other creatures ; and the authority, which he thus bears, is a faint likeness of the absolute power which his creator has over nature.

The notion seems to have prevailed from very early times, that there existed in nature two opposite principles, one the source of all that is good, the other of whatever is evil, in the creation. To this notion the prophet Isaiah is known to allude : and in opposition to it, he represents Jehovah as the only God, as himself the cause of evil as well as of good—"I form the light and create darkness ; I make peace and create evil : I the Lord do all these things," chap. 45. 7. While the Good Principle from all eternity was thought to lead a life of inglorious ease and undisturbed enjoyment, the Bad gave vent to his enmity in the creation of matter, the supposed source of all evil natural and moral. The doctrine that the creator was an evil, imperfect Being, appears to

have prevailed even so early as the age of Moses. Indeed in the early periods of society, it was more likely to prevail than in subsequent periods: for then the evils of life, for want of those conveniences which the arts of civilization supply, were far more numerous than they are at present; and men judging of the Creator by such of his works as they observed and experienced, were led to conceive of him under a very different character from what we are taught to ascribe to him; and this conclusion was countenanced by the severity and apparent cruelty with which his power in an extraordinary manner was sometimes displayed—by the deluge which drowned the world—by the plagues inflicted on Egypt—by the destruction of Pharaoh and his host—by the extermination of the Canaanites—and in general by the seeming confinement of his favours and providence to one nation, and his neglect of all mankind besides. As the opinion that the Parent of the Universe was evil in his nature, and capricious in his operations, was not unknown to Moses, he could not have passed over it when representing the creation as the production of Jehovah. Accordingly he holds him forth as inspecting his works, and pronouncing them to be good—“and God saw that it was good;” and this declaration he repeats *seven times* in the course of the chapter. Surely such a repetition would not have been made, had there not been a necessity for it: and nothing could have rendered it necessary, but the fact now supposed, that there were men who inculcated that the works of God were *not* all good.

The early Christian fathers, following Philo and Josephus, were of opinion that Plato was acquainted with the writings of Moses. This opinion is not improbable, for Plato had been in Egypt, where he might have learnt the Mosaic doctrine through the medium of a Greek translation; and he certainly appears, in opposition to the Egyptian philosophers, to have sided with the Jewish Lawgiver in the notion that the creator was a good and benevolent Being: for he represents the universe as the work of the Supreme God: and he styles him on many occasions, *ὁ ἀγαθός*, as if he intended to repel those who gave him the character of evil. In his *Timæus* there is one passage particularly worthy of notice: *ὥς τε κίνηθεν αὐτὸ καὶ ζῶν ἐνενόησε, τῶν αἰδίων θεῶν γεινόμενον ἄγαλμα, ὁ γέννησας πατὴρ ἠγάσθη τε, καὶ εὐφράνθεις ἔτι δὴ μᾶλλον ὁμοιον πρὸς τὸ παράδειγμα ἐπενενόησεν ἀπεργάσασθαι.* TIM. p. 480.

i. e. “When he saw the system living, and put in motion, and now become the image of the eternal gods, the father who produced it *was glad*, and *being delighted*, he meditated to render it still more like the model of his own perfections.” The spirit, if not the language, here displayed, is extremely like that of Moses, Gen. i. 31: “And God saw every thing that he had made, and behold it was very good.”

CAMBRIDGE TRIPOS, 1803.

ÆGYPTUS.

Quis dolor exagitat mentem, cum passibus oras
 Niliacas peragro lentis, cernoque superbos
 Pyramidum tumulos, pompæ monumenta vetustæ!
 Infelix regio! veteres ut tempus honores
 Funditus evertit! Vos, quorum pectora turgent
 Ambitione levi, cæcæque libidine famæ,
 Huc agite! has paulum intenti spectate ruinas!
 En, ubi turritæ priscis ætatibus urbes
 Artibus ingenuis celebres, opibusque potentes,
 Imperium late tenuerunt, fragmina tantum
 Murorum restant, et nil nisi nominis umbra!

Sed quamvis, Ægypte, geras non amplius altæ
 Sceptra potestatis, quamvis vestigia cuncta
 Splendoris penitus periire extincta prioris,
 Attamen ire juvat, regnique videre ruinas,
 Quod gentes supra quondam caput extulit omnes.
 Lucida doctrinæ sedes! ubi prima per orbem
 Obscurum radios fœcunda Scientia fudit,
 Erroris pepulit nebulas, vitamque per artes
 Excoluit; primum causas cognoscere rerum,
 Occultæ et docuit Naturæ exponere leges.
 Hic etiam cœpit Sculptura animare figuram
 Exanimem, et vivos de marmore ducere vultus.
 Aspice Pyramides, quæ, post tot secula, tautos
 Temporis incursus, jam nunc se ad sidera tollunt,
 Dum positas circum gentes deleverit ætas.

Secula Musa libens densis occulta tenebris
 Præterit, et pugnas refugit memorare cruentas,
 Et grave Martis opus, seriemque evolvere tristem
 Bellorum. Carmen tamen hic Regina Canopi
 Paulisper poscit, quæ telis vicit amoris
 Heroas, belli quos nulla pericula possent.
 Hic Cæsar victor, fugientes, orbe subacto,
 Hostes dum sequitur, totus concessit amorì,
 Emeritæ famæ laudisque oblitus honestæ.
 Atque etiam (miserum dictu) hic Antonius ultio

Imperium mundi amisit, captatus iisdem
Illecebris; puduit nec vincula sumere amoris.

Nec tamen annales opus est pervolvere priscos:
Quid memorem heroas veteres? cum tempora nostra
Ostendant exempla magis dilecta Britannis.
Quam tumet exultans animus, quam fervet amore
Ingenti patriæ, memorat dum fortia Musæ
Facta Britannorum! Quo tempore Gallia naves
Multa gemens doluit submersas, spemque repente
Disjectam, neque jam Nelsoni nomine cessat
Pallere, et nostræ reboanti fulmine Classis.
Nec tantum nostris sonuerunt Æquora factis:
Arma quidem Britonum terra incussere timorem
Ingentem, et claros hic obtinere triumphos.
Cerno procul lætus campos, ubi lecta juvenus
Pectora firma gerens, et semper prodiga vitæ,
Æternas peperit lauros; hostisque cohortes
Quas non ulla prius domuissent agmina bello,
Edocuit, nullo superari Marte Britannos.
Attamen hos gaudens memorat dum Musa triumphos,
Et vox lætitiæ, vultus hilaresque parumper
Tristitiæ cedant. Periit spes alta Britannum,
Dux fortis periit fuso confectus ab hoste!
Collige Veris opes, virides, I, collige lauros,
(Triste ministerium) sertis florentibus orna
Herois tumulum, dignos atque infer honores!
Clarius haud unquam jactavit gloria nomen,
Fortior in tenues nec spiritus exiit auras.

Desine jam laudes heroum, Musa, referre.
Nam minus hic jucunda manent, dum vasta pererro
Deserta, et pedibus Musæ vix pervia regna.
Qua nulli serpunt crepitanti murmure rivi,
Nec redolent frutices, nec rident gramina læta,
Nec lassis arbor jucundam porrigit umbram.
Undique sed gressus hic arida tardat arena,
Perstringitque oculos torrenti lumine fessos.
Felix! cujus iter sola hæc incommoda sistunt!
Nam si forte die medio jactatur arena
Turbine nigranti, et nubes volvuntur opacæ
Pulveris, impatiens æstus sævæque procellæ
Tandem desperans fato succumbit acerbo,
Infaustumque diem lamento luget inani,
Impulerit patriæ dulces cum linquere fines
Auri sacra fames. Nec fortunatior ille,
Qui fugiat nubes, tempestatique supersit;

Hunc fatum crudele manet; namque undique fusi
 Armati miserum spoliant perimuntque latrones.
 Anne minus crudele dedit Natura procellis
 Ingenium? magis hisce furunt mortalia corda?

O Natale Solum! Salve, carissima tellus!
 ANGLIA! Lætitia quali mens visere gestit
 Candentes scopulos, atque ostia tuta carinis!
 Insula ter felix! qua risu oblectat eodem
 Libertas humilesque casas atque atria regum;
 Qua cunctos æque lex respicit, et sua cuique
 Reddit. Cui bello procul armorumque tumultu
 Largum fundit humo victum ditissima tellus:
 Cui fontes nunquam sitiunt; cui jugera rident
 Frumento, et pecudes saliunt in collibus altis.
 Insula dives opum! Pelagi Regina subacti,
 Inconcussa diu maneas! Sub pacis amico
 Artes imperio vigeant! Sic, Libera, perstes
 Addere vim victis, et debellare tyrannos.

OBSERVATIONS

On the 29th Ode, 3d Book of Horace.

THE Alcaic Ode of invitation to Mæcænas, I consider as one of the finest efforts of the Muse of Horace; and should be exceedingly glad to see the only stanza which labours under any obscurity, cleared from all reasonable dispute.

In the *Explicationes veterum aliquot Auctorum* (p. 258=267) Markland gives the following conjecture of an ingenious friend.

III Cærm. xxix. 5. Ita hunc locum legebat et distinguebat, ut pridem forte nosti, Amicus Noster, capitalis ingenii Vir, Nicolæus Hardinge, ὁ μακροπρῆς,

eripe te moræ,
 Ut semper-udum Tibur, et Æsula
 Declive contempleris arvom, &c.

Quo nihil verius puto: ad Tibur enim invitat Mæcenatem Horatius. Vulgo, *eripe te moræ: Ne semper udum Tibur, &c.*

Dr. Parr¹ with his usual warmth and energy has pronounced this to be “a noble emendation;” and the reading is adopted in the text of Mr. Kidd’s late edition of Horace.

I am duely aware of the maxim, *melior conditio possidentis*; and must candidly allow, in general, that some probable account should be given, how the common lection stole in, before it be ejected to make room for an apparent stranger. To this however, in very strong cases like the present, one may venture to plead, *Nullum tempus occurrit regi*.

For observe the absurdity of the vulgar text. *Ne, Neu, or Nec*, whichever you take, must naturally place *semper* in construction with *contemplere*, and of course represent the vigilant minister of Augustus as gazing for ever out of the windows of his Esquiline Palace, like the veriest idler in Rome.

But to the admission of the conjecture made by Markland’s friend Hardinge, and of Markland’s explication in support of it, two facts are quite necessary, which may not be gratuitously assumed.

i. The commentators boldly enough assert, that Mæcenas did enjoy from the Esquiline hill the very prospect of Tibur, of Æsula, and of the high grounds of Tusculum, which the common interpretation of the passage requires.

I should like therefore to know, on the other hand, whether from Horace’s house, if he had one, in the neighbourhood of Tibur, the scenes of Æsula and of Tusculum were clearly in the range of that prospect also: that is, are Tivoli and Frascati within sight of each other?

ii. But had Horace such a house to ask his noble guest to?

When Mr. Bradstreet² was indulging himself in a delightful pilgrimage from Rome by the way of Tivoli to the valley of Licenza, the Digentia of other days; he seems to have concluded with the Abbé Dominico (p. 19.) that Horace had but one *Villa*, and in the Sabine country, because the poet never mentions having any *property* or *demesne*, but that one.

This conclusion, however plausible, does not command my

¹ *British Critic*. March 1794. p. 304. = *Class. Journal*, No. XI. p. 99.

² Vide *The Sabine Farm, &c.* Mawman. 1810.

assent; and whoever will take the trouble to consult the following passages, can hardly fail, I think, to discover that Tibur was not like Præneste the mere *æstivæ deliciæ* to our poet, nor like distant Tarentum dearly loved but seldom visited, nor yet like Baiæ resorted to for its climate or its baths, but a favorite spot of regular and usual residence. In his *Epistles*, when he apologises for his long absence from Rome, Tarentum is mentioned, but Tibur is meant.

vii. 44, 5. *Mihi jam non regia Roma,
Sed vacuum Tibur placet, aut imbellæ Tarentum.*

or if he accuse himself of whimsical humour, the whim oscillates betwixt Rome and Tibur.

viii. 12. *Romæ Tibur amem ventosus, Tibure Romam.*

In the ivth book of *Odes*, the matter strikes very palpably. Tibur was at that time the scene of his poetical labours,

ii. 27. 32. ————— *Ego, apis Matinæ
More modoque
Grata carpentis thyma per laborem
Plurimum, circa nemus uvidique
Tiburis ripas operosa parvus
Carmina fingo.*

Nay, more than this: the woods and the waters of Tibur fashioned and inspired the soul of the poet.

iii. 10. 12. *Sed quæ Tibur aquæ fertile præfluunt,
Et spissæ nemorum comæ,
Fingent Æolio carmine nobilem. —*

Et dubitamus adhuc? Take then the undisputed authority of Suetonius at once. *Vixit plurimum in secessu ruris sui Sabini aut Tiburtini; domusque ejus ostenditur circa Tiburni luculum*—that *Tiburni lucus*, (Carmm. i. vii. 13.) and the enchanting scenes viewed from it; which Horace on his way to the Sabine valley had often halted a day to admire, before he realised that invitation to Mæcenas so beautifully recommended by his moral muse in the Ode now before us.

*Plerumque gratæ divitibus vices
Mundæque parvo sub lare pauperum
Cœnæ, sine aulæis et ostro,
Sollicitam explicuere frontem.*

28th Nov. 1817.

R. S. Y.

NO. XXXII.

Cl. II.

VOL. XVI.

J. T

2 B

P. S. It may not be improper to state, that Mr. *Bradstreet's Sabine Farm* was published only in 1810, his excursion from Rome to Licenza took place in 1795.

Mr. *Forsyth*, in the tenth year of his captivity at Valenciennes, contrived to give an English publication to those masterly *Remarks made in Italy* during the year 1802 and 1803.

The passages, quoted below from his book, were certainly not at hand, nor yet in memory, when the above letter was drawn up. Distinguishing by difference of type what appears to me to be principally erroneous, with very little comment beside, I shall now leave the whole question to the intelligent reader.

In settling the dates of the works of Horace, on which dates the present discussion very much hinges, Dr. Bentley refers to Suetonius's Life of the poet as decisive authority: so much for the point of judgment, on which Mr. Forsyth takes the other side.

Luckily, however, from the hill of Tivoli, Mr. Forsyth tells us, as matter of course, that he saw Frascati in the distance: and so much for the point of fact, which, for want of an eye witness to appeal to, I have timidly and doubtfully proposed.

Pp. 271, 2. "Turning round the woody hill of Catilus, we passed by two convents where two great poets are said to have resided. Catullus's villa is ascertained by his own minute description of the place, by excavated marbles, and by the popular name of Truglia; but it is not so evident, that Horace possessed any house at Tivoli. *He might muse occasionally at Tibur, just as he studied history*" [read Homer] "*at Præneste: he might admire this retreat, just as he admires that of Tarentum.* But the Sabine farm, where the well, and the ruined fane, and every little object around, has that importance which a poet would naturally give to his home, has nothing to represent it within twelve miles of Tivoli." [No one says otherwise.] "Horace calls that farm his only possession" [in the sense of estate]; "and surely we may believe the poet himself rather than a biographer whose very name is disputed."

P. 275. "The hill of Tivoli is all over picture. The town, the villas, the ruins, the rocks, the cascades, in the fore-ground; the Sabine hills, the three Monticelli, Soracte, Frascati, the Cam-

pagna, and Rome in the distance: these form a succession of landscapes superior, in the delight produced, to the richest cabinet of Claude's. Tivoli cannot be described: no true portrait of it exists: all views alter and embellish it: they are poetical translations of the matchless original."

————— Eripe te moræ;
Ut semper-udum Tibur et Æsulæ
Declive contempleris arvom, et
Telegoni juga Parricidæ.

ROMAN INSCRIPTION AT TARRAGONA.¹

Multa renascentur, quæ jam cecidere.—HOR.

AGREEABLY with my promise, I send you a copy of a Roman inscription lately dug up at Tarragona. It was discovered, along with upwards of forty others, in consequence of a battery having been thrown up by our soldiers about three hundred yards from the walls of that place. Other, and more considerable, relics of Roman fabrication and design, were found there at the same time. The chief of these were, a Mosaic or tessellated pavement, the remains of a circus and ampitheatre, and an aqueduct, which is in a very good state of preservation. This information, along with the inscription, was given me by a particular friend, who received it from a near relation, resident some little time ago at Tarragona. When I last saw him, he had promised the inscription to another publication; and on this account I found some difficulty in persuading him to give me the use of it for the *Classical Journal*. Whether it has appeared any where else, or not, I am unable to say. Be that as it may, the insertion of it in your Journal will not be the means of taking up any superabundance of room. The slab is in the form of a rectangular parallelogram, whose height is thirty-seven inches, and base twenty-five.

L. PERPERNAE
NVMISIANO
IIII VIRO
AVGVSTAL
TI. CLAVDIVS
AMIAVTVS
AMICOOPTIM

¹ This article was written as long ago as 1814., but having been misplaced, could not be inserted sooner. ED.

For PERPERNÆ we ought perhaps to read PERPENNÆ. Mention is made of Romans of this name by Livy, Plutarch, Paterculus, Valerius Maximus, and others. It is very likely that the mistake may exist upon the stone itself, as it is a fact well-known that the ancient letter-cutters were frequently very illiterate men. Consult, among others, who have treated on this subject, Cellarius, in his *Orthographia Latina*. We find on record the name of M. Perpenna, who was Consul with C. Claudius Pulcher, in the years 624 and 662 from the building of the city. It may be worth the while to observe that Ainsworth, in giving his name on the *first* occasion, styles him Perperna; which may have been occasioned by the circumstance of its being so read in some editions of Livy. The inscription, at full, runs thus: LUCIO PERPENNÆ NUMISIANO SEXTUM VIRO AUGUSTALI TIBERIUS CLAUDIUS AMIANTUS AMICO OPTIMO. The name of the man who put up the stone, seems to be of Greek origin (ἀμιάντος). He was probably a naturalised Greek. "Augustales, qui primos ordines in bello ducebant." *Veget. de Re Militari*.

N. A.

AN IMPORTANT PASSAGE OF PHOTIUS CORRECTED.

The following passage of the learned Photius has engaged a considerable portion of attention amongst learned men: and a few remarks upon it may deserve a place in the *Classical Journal*. Speaking of Justus of Tiberias, the rival of Josephus, he says, Bibliothec. Cod. 33. "Ἀρχεται τῆς ἱστορίας ἀπὸ Μωσέως, καταλήγει δὲ ἕως τελευτῆς Ἀγρίππα, τοῦ ἐβδόμου μὲν ἀπὸ τῆς οἰκίας Ἡρώδου, ὑστάτου δὲ ἐν τοῖς Ἰουδαίων βασιλεῦσιν· ὃς παρέλαβε μὲν τὴν ἀρχὴν ἐπὶ Κλαυδίου, ὑψήθη ἐπὶ Νέρωνος, καὶ ἔτι μᾶλλον ἐπὶ Οὐεσπασιανοῦ, τελευτᾷ δ' ἔτι τρίτῳ Τραϊανοῦ, οὗ καὶ ἡ ἱστορία κατέληξεν.

In this passage Agrippa the younger is represented as having lived to the third year of Trajan; and Justus as having continued his history to that period. Now Josephus, in his life, notices this history of his rival; and it appears very evident that Agrippa had died at least ten years before Trajan began to reign. His words are the following. Εἰ δὲ θαρρεῖς ἄμεινον πάντων συγγεγραφεῖναι, διὰ τί, ζώντων Οὐεσπασιανοῦ καὶ Τιτοῦ τῶν αὐτοκρατόρων τοῦ πολέμου γενομένων, καὶ βασιλέως Ἀγρίππα περιόντος ἔτι, καὶ τῶν ἐκγένους αὐτοῦ πάντων, ἀνδρῶν τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς παιδείας ἐπὶ πλεῖστον ἡκόντων, τὴν ἱστορίαν οὐκ ἔφερες εἰς μέσον; πρὸ γὰρ εἵκοσιν ἔτῶν εἶχες γεγραμμένην, καὶ παρ' εἰδότην ἑμελλες τῆς ἀκριβείας τὴν μαρτυρίαν ἀποφέρεισθαι. νῦν δ' ὅτε ἐκεῖνοι μὲν οὐκ ἔτι εἰσὶ μεθ' ἡμῶν, ἐλεγχθῆναι δ' οὐ νομίζεις, τεθάρρηκας. *Josephi Vita: §. 65.* "If you are confident that you have related these events better than any other writer, how came you not to bring

your narrative before the public, while Vespasian and Titus, the generals in chief of the war, and while Agrippa and his kindred, men extensively versed in the literature of Greece, were yet among the living. For you withheld your history *above twenty years*, thus declining the testimony of all those, who from their own knowledge were able to sanction its truth. But now, while they are no more among the living, you have ventured to publish it, as being no longer liable to be refuted."

At the close of his *Antiquities* Josephus bespeaks the indulgence of his readers for annexing a short memoir of his own life and family. This memoir, therefore, is but an Appendix of the Jewish Antiquities, composed and published at the same time with that immortal production: and he is express in declaring that he finished it the 13th year of Domitian, about five and twenty years after the destruction of Jerusalem, or the close of the Jewish War. Now it is clear from the above extract that Agrippa lived about *twenty years* after the same event. For while Vespasian, Titus, Agrippa, and his kindred were alive, Justus declined publishing his history, and suppressed it on this account above twenty years.

Thus, the assertion of Photius, as the language now stands, is grossly erroneous: but his text is assuredly corrupted, as it is extremely improbable that a writer so learned and accurate as Photius could have been guilty of so great a blunder. And it is remarkable that the change of one letter in the text will give the whole a different meaning.

The title of this work of Justus was "The Chronology of the kings of Judah." The writer begins with Moses, who was virtually, though not nominally, a king, and ends with Agrippa, the last king of the Jews: ἀρχεται τῆς ἱστορίας ἀπὸ Μωσέως, καταλήγει δ' ἕως τελευτῆς Ἀγρίππα. The last clause is not Greek, nor can a corresponding expression be sense in any language, "he ceases so far as the death," or, "he ends until the death of Agrippa." The title shows that the principal object of Justus was to ascertain and enumerate the several Jewish kings, in connexion with the leading events of their reign: and the term appropriate to him as a *chronologist* was καταλέγω. "He began his history from Moses, and he in succession numbers the kings of Judah till the death of Agrippa the last of them." His history, thus far finished, he published after the death of Agrippa: and to this publication Josephus refers. But it does not follow that, as he lived some years longer, he did not continue his history of the Jews; his purpose, possibly, being to publish an annual account of their state and sufferings under the Roman emperors. It is observable, moreover, that where Photius speaks of Justus he uses the *present* tense, as speaking of a history then extant, but employs a *past* tense, when speaking of Agrippa. It is natural, therefore, to refer τελευτᾷ, not to Agrippa, but to Jus-

tus himself. The whole passage will then stand thus: "He begins his history with Moses, and numbers the kings to the death of Agrippa, the seventh that reigned in the family of Herod, and the last that ruled over the Jews, having received his kingdom under Claudius, and augmented it under Nero, and still more amply under Vespasian; he dies in the third year of Trajan, where his history terminates." The last clause, "where history terminates," makes it evident that Photius meant the author, when he used the verb τελευτᾷ: and this renders the whole clear in itself, and consistent with truth.

Now, it is surprising that many of the learned, such as Scaliger, Noldius, Grotius, Hutson, and Whiston, instead of sifting the supposed assertion of Photius, have received it as true, and were hence thrown upon the most improbable conjectures respecting the time in which the works of Josephus appeared. One of these was that the Epaphroditus, to whom he dedicates his *Antiquities*, was not the secretary of Nero mentioned by Suetonius and Dion, but another who flourished under Trajan. In an early number of the *Classical Journal* I have shown that this same Epaphroditus, who was also the master of Epictetus, was an illustrious convert to the Christian faith. I will shortly recapitulate the circumstances which prove this important fact.

From Suetonius and Dion Cassius it seems *probable* that Epaphroditus was a believer: for both these join his death with that of *Clemens*, who suffered for his conversion. [Suet. c. 14. 19. Dion. lib. 77. 14.] From Josephus we might also conclude that he was a convert to the *Jewish Institutions*, as the gospel was then called. The heathens who rejected Christianity, rejected also with affected contempt the true history of the Jews, and adopted with avidity the falsehoods propagated by Apion and others respecting their origin. Nor can we find a criterion by which we can ascertain with more probability the feelings of a heathen respecting Christ, than the part he took with regard to the history of the Jews. All the enemies of Jesus adopted the expedient of calumniating his nation; while those only, who were favorable to him and his cause, wished to know the truth. On this side of the question we see Epaphroditus firmly enlisted. For Josephus, near the close of his work, thus writes, "To thee, Epaphroditus, *who lovest the truth*, and to those who, like thee, wish to know our laws and nations, I dedicate this book."

The apostle Paul, writing from Rome, Phil. i. 4. declares that his bonds in Christ were made known *in the whole palace*, and he presently mentions Epaphroditus by name, as one who had hazarded his life in the service of Christ. And here the name, the time, the place serve to identify the friend of the apostle with the patron of Josephus.

The words of the Apostle, though not a studied encomium, represent Epaphroditus as distinguished by sincerity, firmness, and magnanimity; as having not only impaired his health, but risked his very existence, by attempting to shield his illustrious friend from the bigotry and malice of his imperial master: and Josephus affirms of him, that "he displayed a mind wonderfully powerful, and an inflexible adherence to virtue;" meaning no doubt by "virtue," that high integrity, that superiority to the world, and even to the fear of death, with which the Gospel inspired its early votaries.

In the first and second centuries the notion seems to have been general, that a convert from Heathenism ought immediately to relinquish his station in society, especially if engaged in pursuits under the Emperor, as inconsistent with the virtues of Christianity. Clement acted up to this opinion, and his seclusion brought upon him the imputation of "the most contemptible inertness." Epaphroditus followed an opposite course; and he thus incurred the suspicion and displeasure of the church at Philippi, where they "heard that he was infirm," meaning, not that he was sick in body, but infirm in the faith, *vid. Rom. iv. 19.* The Apostle takes up the term "infirm," and, agreeably to his usual manner, applies it in a new and energetic sense, to set forth his magnanimity and zeal in the cause of his divine master. "For he was indeed infirm, so as to be near death." His infirmity was only an impaired health, arising from fatigue and anxiety, and a noble determination to meet death in the service of Christ. But Providence interposed and averted the fury of the Emperor: and he was thus restored to be the comfort and support of the Apostle. Epaphroditus naturally wished to visit the Christians at Philippi, thus hoping to dissipate their prejudices against him. With this wish the Apostle concurred: and having delegated him, he calls upon them to receive him as a man *of deeds*, and not a man *of mere profession* in Christ.

The language of our Apostle, when speaking of Epaphroditus, is deduced by association from his occupation under Nero; and his object was to do away the odium attached to those names by applying them in a secondary, metaphorical sense to his character as a believer in Christ. From being a soldier under Nero, St. Paul styles him "my fellow-soldier." In reference to his being a minister of, or attendant on, the Emperor, he calls him "minister of my wants." As "the slave of Nero," a reproach his conduct might have brought upon him even from his mistaken friends, the Apostle in his letter to the Colossians farther designates him as the "slave of Christ," meaning, that while he appeared as the servant of a tyrant, he was really the servant of that divine Master, whose

service was perfect freedom. As a minister of State, Epaphroditus possessed *authority* and *wealth*, and he nobly employed them in supplying the necessities, and protecting the person, of his illustrious friend. "For the work of Christ he was near death, having hazarded his life to fill up the deficiency of your service toward me." Some of the believers at Philippi had doubtless the means of relieving his wants, and perhaps by their influence and connexions at Rome materially to aid the Apostle. But they neglected their duty, at least in part: and the Apostle delicately reminds them that the man whom they disparaged for not holding forth his profession to the world, had the merit to supply their neglect in both these respects.

JOHN JONES.

ORCHOMENIAN INSCRIPTION,

FROM THE ORIGINAL IN THE BRITISH MUSEUM.

1. αρχοντος εν ερχομενυ θυναρχω μει
2. νος αλαλκομενιω εν δε Φελατιη με
3. νοιταο αρχελαω μεινος πρατω ομο
4. λογα ευβωλυ Φελατιηυ κη τη πολι ερ
5. χομενιω εν επιδει κεκομιστη ευβω
6. λος παρ τας πολιος το δανειον απαν
7. κατ τας ομολογιας τας τεθεισας θυ
8. ναρχω αρχοντος μεινος θειλουθιω
9. κη ουτ οφειλετη αυτω ετι ουθεν παρ τας
10. πολιν αλλ απεχι παντα περι παντος
11. κη αποδεδοανθι τη πολι τυ εχοντες
12. τας ομολογιας ειμεν ποτι δεδομε
13. νον χρονον ευβωλυ επινομιας Φετια
14. πετταρα βουεσσι σουν ιππυς διακα
15. τιης Φικατι προβατυς σουν ηγυς χει
16. λης αρχι τω χρονω ο ενιαυτος ο μετα
17. θυναρχον αρχοντα ερχομενιυς απο
18. γραφεσθη δε ευβωλον κατ ενιαυτον
19. εκαστον παρ τον ταμιαν κη τον νομω

20. ναν τα τε καυμάτα των προβατων κη
 21. ταν ηγων κη ταν βουων κη ταν ιππων κ*
 22. κα τινα ασαμε ιωνθι κη το πλειθος με*
 23. απογραφεσθω δε πλιονα των γεγραμ
 24. μενων εν τη συγχωρεισι η δε κα τις
 25. ***** *η το εννομιον ευβωλον οφειλ
 26. ***** λισ των ερχομενιων αργουριω
 27. ***** πετταρακοντα ευβωλυ καθ εκα
 28. ***** νιαυτον κ* τοκον φερετω δρα*
 29. ***** τας μνας εκαστας κατα μεινα
 30. ***** τον κη εμπρακτος εστΟCVP
 31. ***** TON EP M

Read,

21. κῆ (i. e. καὶ εἰ)
 22. μεῖ (i. e. μὴ)
 24. ἐν τῇ συγχωρεσί. ἡ, δὲ κά τις
 25. ἐμπράττη τὸν ἐννόμιον Εὐβόλω, ὀφειλ-
 26. ἔτω ἢ πόλις τῶν Ἐρχομενίων ἀργουρίω
 27. μνᾶς πετταράκοντα Εὐβώλῳ καθ' ἑκασ-
 28. τον ἐνιαυτόν· κῆ τόκον φερέτω δραχ-
 29. μᾶς . . . τᾶς μνᾶς ἐκάστας κατὰ μείνα
 30. ἑκάστον· κῆ ἐμπρακτος ἔστω Εὐβώλῳ
 31. κατὰ τὴν τῶν Ἐρχομενίων νόμω.

1. Ἄρχοντος ἐν Ὀρχομενῷ Θυνάρχου, μη-
 2. νὸς Ἀλαλκομενίου, ἐν δὲ Ἐλατεία Με-
 3. νοίτου Ἀρχελάου, μηνὸς πρώτου Ὀμο-
 4. λογία Εὐβούλῳ Ἐλατειαίῳ καὶ τῇ πόλει Ὀρ-
 5. χομενίων. Ἐπειδὴ κεκόμισται Εὐβου-
 6. λος παρὰ τῆς πόλεως τὸ δάνειον ἅπαν
 7. κατὰ τὰς ὁμολογίας τὰς τεθείσας Θυ-
 8. νάρχου ἄρχοντος μηνὸς Θειλουθίου,
 9. καὶ οὐκ (qu.) ὀφείλεται αὐτῷ ἔτι οὐδὲν παρὰ τὴν
 10. πόλιν ἀλλ' ἀπέχει πάντα περὶ παντὸς,
 11. καὶ ἀποδεδώκασιν τῇ πόλει οἱ ἔχοντες
 12. τὰς ὁμολογίας· εἶναι πρὸς δεδόμε-
 13. νον χρόνον Εὐβούλῳ ἐπινομίας, ἔτη
 14. τέτταρα, βουσί σὺν ἵπποις διηκο-
 15. σίαις εἴκοσι, προβάτοις σὺν αἰξὶ χι-
 16. λίαις. Ἄρχει τοῦ χρόνου ὁ ἐνιαυτὸς ὁ μετὰ
 17. Θυνάρχον ἄρχοντα Ὀρχομενίοις. Ἀπο-

18. γράφεσθαι δὲ Εὐβουλον κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν
19. ἕκαστον παρὰ τὸν ταμίαν καὶ τὸν νομώ-
20. νην τὰ τε καύματα τῶν προβάτων καὶ
21. τῶν αἰγῶν καὶ τῶν βοῶν καὶ τῶν ἵππων, κἄν
22. τινα ἄσημα ᾧσι, καὶ τὸ πλῆθος· μὴ
23. ἀπογραφέσθω δὲ πλείονα τῶν γεγραμ-
24. μένων ἐν τῇ συγχωρήσει. Ἐὰν δέ τις
25. ἐμπράττῃ τὸ ἐννόμιον Εὐβουλον, ὀφειλ-
26. ἔτω ἡ πόλις τῶν Ὀρχομενίων ἀργυρίου
27. μνᾶς τετταράκοντα Εὐβούλῳ καθ' ἕκα-
28. στον ἐνιαυτόν· καὶ τόκον φερέτω δραχ-
29. μᾶς τῆς μνᾶς ἐκάστης κατὰ μῆνα
30. ἕκαστον, καὶ ἔμπρακτος ἔστω Εὐβούλῳ
31. κατὰ τοὺς τῶν Ὀρχομενίων νόμους.

STELOCOPOS.

INSCRIPTION

ON THE TOMB OF ARRIAN.

THROUGH the medium of your Journal, permit me to gratify a foreign correspondent, and an English antiquary, whose curiosity respecting "*The Tomb of Arrian*" seems much excited. That I claimed the discovery of this monument, was announced in the Seventh Volume of your work, (No. XIII. April, 1813, p. 233.) and in other periodical publications. For the satisfaction of those gentlemen above-mentioned, it will, I trust, be sufficient to give, on this occasion, a copy of the inscription, which expresses that,—“Arrian the son of Dædalsus died in the forty-eighth year of his age,”—and concludes with the usual valediction:—

APPIANOS
ΔΟΙΔΑΛΣΟΥ
ΖΗΣ ΕΤΗ
ΜΗ
ΧΑΙΠΕ

I must reserve for the account of my Travels, (now far advanced through the press) an engraved delineation, and a fuller description of this monument; which we are justified, perhaps, in attributing to the eminent writer Arrian; as it is situate not very far from Nicomedia, his birth-place, in Bithynia; a country where, as it appears from Strabo, (Lib. XII.) Memnon (in Photii Biblioth.) and others, Δοίδαλος or Δι-
δαλος was an ancient name of some celebrity.

December, 1817.

WILLIAM OUSELEY.

ADVERSARIA LITERARIA.

NO. XIV.

Epitaphia Duo, ab Angelo Maio, vel alio quovis, nuper reperta.

Ἐπὶ Σκοτίου τοῦ Σκύθου.

ὦ ξεῖνοι, Σκοτίας ὅδ' ἀρηϊῶ ἐν Μαραθῶνι

Κεῖμαι, ἀριστεύσας ἔξακίς ἐν πολέμῳ.

Schol. Σκοτίας οὗτος Σκύθης ἦν, ὃς ἐς Ἑλλάδα ἀφικόμενος, ἔξ μὲν πολεμικά ποιήματα σὺν δόξῃ τινὶ ἔγραψεν, ἐν δὲ τῷ ἐβδόμῳ (Μαραθῶνι ὀνομασμένῳ) πολὺ ἐσφάλη.

Ἐπὶ Τίμωνος τοῦ Μισανθρώπου.

Τίμων ἐνθαδὲ κεῖμαι, ὑπὸ κλεινοῦ Κορίνθου

Μαρνάμενος δῆτοισι· σὺ δ', ὦ ξένε, μή μ' ἐλέαιρ᾽

Καὶ γὰρ ἐγὼ σε, ζωὸς ἔων, ἤχθηρα μάλ' αἰνῶς.

Schol. Τίμων, Μισάνθρωπος καλούμενος, ὃς Ἀθήνησι μὲν ἐπαιδεύθη, ἀνδραθεὶς δὲ, πολλὰς τινὰς χώρας διέβη, ἡδόνην ἀναζητῶν. καὶ οὐχ εὐρῶν, πολλὰ βιβλία ξυνέγραψεν, ἵνα ἐνδείξειε πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις, ὡς ἀθλίως διακεῖτο. τελευτῶν δὲ, σὺν τοῖς βαρβάροις Κόρινθον πολιορκήσας, ἀπέθανε.

Ascribed to the Pen of a late learned Subprofessor at Cambridge, on the Exclusion of himself and a Brother-Scholar of Trinity (both at the head of their respective pursuits—as senior Medallist, and senior Wrangler) from the office of saying Grace on Trinity Sunday.

Unà ibant Juvenes duo

Ripam ad flumineam forte; silentium

Triste ambòs tenet, et dolor :

Luctûs causa eadem, culpa eadem ; Deus

Pleno non dederat loqui

Ore, at lingua minùs congrua gutturi,

- Et tornata malè, invidet
 Ne quà verba sonent sesquipedalia.
 Tum par flebile turturum
 Alternò incipiunt cum gemitu :—B. “ Scelus
 Quid feci in proprium larem,
 Ut me tu, Juvenum sancte Pater, vetes
 Pransuris benedicere ?”
- R. “ Sprevisi quoque me : muneris at memor
 Flamen fidus eram tibi.”
- B. “ At quamvis mihi vox barbara Vandalum,
 Et raucum sonuit Gothum :”—
- R. “ Quamvis et statuâ sim taciturnior,
 Et multùm timeo loqui :”—
- B. “ Quamvis ora magis cardine dissona,
 A quo janua vertitur :”—
- R. “ Quamvis me superat ventus et improbus,
 Per rimam tenuem strepens :”—
- B. “ Quamvis me superant Indica tympana,
 Incus pulsare malleo :”—
- R. “ Quamvis me superat pullus avis querens,
 Si nido genitrix abest :”—
- B. “ Non flavens meruit dedecus hoc coma,
 Aut gressus pedis impares :”—
- R. “ Nec nos hoc tulimus jure, quia in genis
 Nostris gratia non nitet.”
- B. “ At me Pythagoras seliget ut suum,
 Æternùmque silens bibam
 Doctrinam ex liquido fonte matheseos :”—
- R. “ At nobis lyra vox erit ;
 Dum, corvi veluti, grex alius strepunt.”

Epitaphium in Filium, Ulmo Inscriptum.

Hanc Ego, quam, felix annis melioribus, Ulmum
 Ipse manu sevi, Tibi, dilectissime Fili,
 Consecro in æternum, Gulielme ; vocabitur arbos
 Hæc tua, servabitque tuum per sæcula nomen.
 Te, Generose Puer, nil muneris hujus egentem,
 Te, jam perfunctum Belli Vitæque labore,
 Respexit Deus, et cœlestibus intulit oris—
 Me tamen afflictum, me consolabitur ægrum
 Hoc tibi, quod solvo, quanquam leve, munus amoris.
 Quinetiam assiduè huc veniam, neglectaque vitæ,
 De te, care Puer, meditando, tempora ducam.

Sæpe tuam recolens formam, dulcesque loquelas,
 Dictaque tam sacro et sapienti corde profecta,
 Quàm festiva quidem, et dulci condita lepore—
 Et Te, qui nostris quandoque, accesseris hæres
 Sedibus, hoc oro : mœsti reverere parentis,
 Nec tu sperne preces, quos hâc super arbore fundo—
 Sit tibi non invisâ—sit inviolata securi—
 Et quantum Natura sinat, crescat monumentum
 Egregii Juvenis, qui sævâ est morte peremptus,
 Fortiter ob patriam pugnando—Sic tibi constans
 Sit Fortuna Domus—sit nulli obnoxia damno—
 Nec videas unquam jucundi funera Nati!

IV. C.

The following verses were written at Winchester School by one of the most learned Prelates of the Church of England and Ireland.

Equus Bellator. vid. Jobum, c. xxxix.

TUNE animos fortes validumque, pusille, dedisti,
 Robur Equo rapidosque pedes—atque ardua colla,
 Fulminibus vestita, habiliq[ue] micantia fato ?
 En Belli loricam indutus et arma—superbus
 Pondere terribili, graditur tundens grave terram
 Alternis pedibus, nec territat obvia messis
 Cuspidis instantis, clypeorum aut fulgidus horror.
 Et nunc ignescens nares, et fræna recusans
 Fracta, fremit dirum, et venientes provocat hostes
 Hinnitu, absentesque iterans terit ungula turmas.
 At simul optatum signum bibit auribus æris,
 Et litui souere, infit vix credulus, hah ! hah !
 Fervere tunc artus—tunc tendere terra retrorsum,
 Inque latus concussa strepunt sibi suaviter arma—
 Quin nunc plus fidens animi, jam robore noto,
 Mordet humum indignans—renuit terrore moveri,
 Et gestit captare fugæque metusque ululatum,
 Clamoremque, minas ducum, dirasque cadentum—

On leaving Sharpham Park, for Ireland, at a period of much political apprehension in that country.

CARA Domus, valeas! carique valete Penates,
 Editus unde mihi connubialis amor!
 Seu vis me rapiat truculenta rebellibus armis,
 Seu sortem expectet tuta senecta suam,
 His Laribus—canit augurium præsağa mali mens—
 Pes meus his Laribus, non rediturus, abit!
 O pia spes—O amanda! tuum est optare, propinquos
 Rursus in æterna posse coire Domo:
 Purior ætherios ubi pascet spiritus artus,
 Nostraque nobilior corda beabit Amor.

C. C.

*Ad Uxorem Suam, in Insulâ Sanctæ Vincentiæ commorantem,
 Sibi in Tortolâ desideratè expectatam.*

O SPERATA diu, venias suavissima conjux,
 Nec fidi incipias immemor esse viri.
 Solus in ingratâ reputo novus hospes, arenâ
 Quæ formidandæ sit tibi causa moræ.
 Te sine, vix tardum video procedere mensem
 Dum varii mentem stringit imago mali.
 Ne nitidi juvenes te fors dulcedine tangant,
 Dum festi incedis gloria prima chori.
 Seu pelagi subeas metuenda pericula sævi,
 Sive premas vigilem, languida febre, torum.
 Absint hæc oro! et casti mihi pignus amoris,
 Quamque vehis matrem, parva carina, sinu,
 Incolumes referas! pars hæc est optima nostri,
 Sic tibi rite feram munera, numen aquæ,
 Rumpe moras, adamata Uxor, mihi clarior uni,
 Huc propera celerem ferre, Maria, pedem.
 Hic est quod gratæ poterit dare gaudia vitæ,
 Hic est, si desint cetera, fidus Amor.

T. BURROWS.

PORSON'S CHARADES.

To a Lady who had resolved to marry none but a Clergyman.

On my first ¹ if kind fortune had placed me with you,
 We surely my second ² might hope to obtain ;
 I might marry you, were I my whole, ³ it is true,
 But that marriage would only embitter my pain. ⁴

To Chloe.

My first ⁵ with more than Quaker's pride, ⁶
 At your most solemn duty, ⁷
 You keep, nor deign to lay aside,
 E'en though it veil your beauty ;
 My second ⁸ on your cheek, or lip,
 Some pleasure might inspire,
 But, in your eye, or nose's tip,
 Could ne'er inflame desire ;
 My whole ⁹ if you should entertain,
 For your unhappy poet,
 I pray thee, Chloe, spare him pain,
 And never let him know it.

To the same.

On Chloe's soft lip if my first ¹⁰ could be seen,
 No lover on earth would sue for her kisses ;
 My next ¹¹ on Parnassus's top oft hath been,
 Adoration to pay to the nine rhyming misses : ¹²
 My whole ¹³ is the case of each mettlesome blade,
 When at home he is peaceful and quiet,
 But soon laid aside, if we e'er want his aid,
 To quell, or to join in, a riot.

Another.

My first, ¹⁴ though your house, nay, your life he defends,
 You ungratefully use, like the wretch you despise ;
 My second, ¹⁵ I say it with grief, comprehends
 All the good, all the brave, all the learned and wise.
 Of my whole, ¹⁶ I have little, or nothing to say,
 Except that it tells ¹⁷ the departure of day.

¹ On a *par* ; Porson had at that time nothing to depend upon but a Professorship of 40*l.* *per annum*.

² A *son*. ³ A *par-son*. ⁴ Porson's aversion to Holy Orders is well known.

⁵ Your *hat*. ⁶ Quakers move the hat to none. ⁷ At Church.

⁸ *Red*, the colour. ⁹ *Hat-red*.

¹⁰ A *scab*. ¹¹ A *bard*.

¹² The Muses.

¹³ A *scab-bard*.

¹⁴ A *cur-dog*.

¹⁵ *Few*.

¹⁶ The *Cur-few*.

¹⁷ Query, *tolls*.

Literary Intelligence.

JUST PUBLISHED.

CLASSICAL.

Nos. III. and IV. of the *New and Improved Edition* of STEPHENS' GREEK THESAURUS are just published. Pr. 1*l.* 3*s.* each, large paper 2*l.* 10*s.* To be completed in about 24 Numbers. Of this production we cannot enter into particulars till it is completed. In Mr. DIBDIN's most interesting and superb work, the *Bibliographical Decameron*, we find the following observations on the new edition of Stephens, which we hope may be generally read and felt by our senators as well as the subscribers to the work.

"The undertaking is arduous in the extreme, and perhaps not a little perilous: yet let us admire the zeal, and love of ancient lore, which could have matured, and carried into execution, a project so vast, so expensive, and requiring such constant, unremitting, and (I had almost said,) interminable labour. I address myself to the candid, the experienced, and the liberal; not to those, who, previous to the publication of the first number, were sharpening their critical knives, and preparing other instruments of literary torture, whereby they might inflict a severe wound, and cause premature death to the undertaking! English critics, I trust, like English soldiers and sailors, love fairer play than this. Nor can such attempts, after all, damp the ardour, or slacken the exertions, of those to whose conduct this 'monumentum ære perennius' is entrusted. Let us tell an interesting and unsophisticated tale.

"A new Edition of the *Greek Thesaurus* of H. Stephen the younger, must necessarily, in any shape, be a tremendous undertaking; especially too, when one thinks of the multiplicity of lexicographical and critical knowledge which has pervaded the classical world, since the first appearance of that wonderful performance. Only to give an impulse, or encouragement to the plan—only to bring the vessel to the water's edge, as it were—required spirit, strength, and no ordinary assistance. In letters, circular notes, prospectuses, &c. announcing the nature and extent of it, it cost the proprietors of the work not less than 1,500*l.* This was surely bold enough: for till *seven hundred subscribers* were subscribed, its progress would be uncertain, and the loss sufficiently decisive. However, the plan 'grew,' and the subscribers multiplied; and the names of not fewer than *nine hundred and eighty-five* [1086] of them graced the covering of the first number. Such a number, to *such* a work, is, I believe, without a precedent: and well might

LORD GRENVILLE, the Chancellor of the University of Oxford, express a pleasurable pride in receiving the homage of the Dedication of the new *Thesaurus* to HIMSELF. That Nobleman's letter to the Printer, upon the occasion of which we are speaking, does equal honor to his head and heart. Now comes the *glory* of the design. All attempts which had been made towards a new edition of Stephens' *Thesaurus*, in *Germany, Russia, France, and Denmark*, have not only been rendered abortive; but the materials for it, collected in those places, have been almost voluntarily, as well as absolutely, poured into the capacious reservoir of A. J. VALPY.

"The manner in which this new edition is given to the public, need not be specifically mentioned. All the classical world are aware of it; but, for comeliness and proportion, the nicer collector will betake himself to the *large paper*. In the small paper, the text looks abundant and honest to excess. It was the intention of Mr. Valpy to have struck off *three copies* UPON VELLUM, at 300 guineas each copy; but the POISONING INFLUENCE of that RECENT, RASH, AND RUTHLESS act of Parliament, respecting literary property, which gave one copy of the *best* kind to the British Museum, (the *least* pernicious feature in such act,) diverted his intentions."

The vacancies yet open have been occasioned by the decease of some of the Subscribers. The price to such as were not on the original list has been already raised; and the Editors, according to the advertisement to No. 111., mean, it should seem, shortly to raise it again. We should recommend all *public Libraries*, in particular, to subscribe before the opportunity is lost, as only a sufficient number of copies have been printed to cover the subscription.

Elogium Johannis Meermanni, auctore Henr. Const. Cras. Amstelodami. 8vo. 1817. pagg. x. + 125.

Iconographie Romaine, par le Chevalier E. R. Visconti; première partie. Paris: de l'imprimerie de Didot. 1817. format Atlantique.

Albertinæ Magni Ducatus Zaeringo Badensis Universitatis Literarum nomine initium lectionum publicarum, ad 21. Aprilis, 1817. indicit Dr. To. Leon. Hug, Ordinis Theologorum Decanus. Accedit Lucubratio de Oratione Ciceronis pro Marcello. Friburgi. 1817. 4to. pagg. 22.

Lucæ Holstenii Epistolæ ad Diversos, quas ex editis et ineditis Codd. collegit atque illustravit Io. Franc. Boissonade. Accedit Editoris Commentatio ad Inscriptionem Græcam. Paris. 1817. 8vo. pagg. viii. + 538.

* See *Classical Journal*, No. VIII. p. 513.

The Dissertation is dedicated to a learned Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, the Rev. P. P. Dobree.

We shall give extracts in a future No.

De Mythologia Græcorum antiquissima Dissertatio, scripta a God. Hermanno. Lips. 1817. 4to. pagg. 36.

Arati Phænomena et Diosemea, quibus subjiciuntur Eratosthenis Catasterismi: Dionysii Orbis terrarum Descriptio: Rufi Arieni utriusque poetæ Metaphrases. Curavit notasque adjecit A. Matthiæ. Francf. ad M. 1817. 8vo. pagg. viii. + 398.

Gauterius, Comes Briennensis; carmen. Argumentum ex historia S. Ludovici a Tonvillæo scripta desumptum. Sequitur alterum carmen cui inscribitur: Hollandia a Ludovico M. debellata. Paris. 8vo. 1817. pagg. 55.

Le Bonheur de l'Étude, discours en vers, et autres Poésies; par Ch. Loyson. Paris. 1817. 12mo. pagg. viii. + 214.

We announce in the *Classical Journal* this volume, because it contains some very elegant translations, or imitations, of Ovid, Propertius, Tibullus, Horace, and Anacreon.

Recherches Historiques et Critiques sur les Mystères du Paganisme, par M. le Baron de Sainte Croix: seconde Edit. revue et corrigée par M. le Bar. Silvestre de Sacy. Paris. 1817. 2 vol. 8vo. T. i. pagg. lxxviii. + 472: T. ii. pagg. 350. + 113.

Etablissement du Lycée Richelieu à Odessa, fondé par un ukase de S. M. L'Empereur de Toutes les Russies, en date du 2 Mai, 1817. Paris. 1817. in fol. pagg. 50. with beautiful plates, &c.

Mémoire sur les Médailles de Marinus frappées à Philippopolis; par Tôchon d'Annecy, &c. Paris. 1817. 4to. pagg. 57.

To this Memoir is added: Notice sur une Médaille de l'Empereur Iôtapianus.

La Satire de Sulpicia contre Domitien; traduite en vers Français avec des notes par Ch. Monnard, ministre du S. Ev. Paris. 1816. 8vo. pagg. 68.

Inscriptiones Romanas que existen en Menorca, y otras relativas a la misma, sacadas de varios escritores, suplidas e ilustradas en quanto se ha podido, por el Dr. D. Juan Ramis y Ramis, de la Real Academia de la Historia, &c. Mahon. 1817. 8vo. pagg. 223.

Second Mémoire sur la valeur des *Monnaies* de compte chez les peuples de l'Antiquité; par M. le C. Garnier, associé libre de l'Acad. Royale des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres. Paris. 1817. 4to. pagg. xvi. + 44.

Charili Samii quæ supersunt collegit et illustravit; de Chœrili ætate, vita, et poesi, aliisque Chœrili disseruit Aug. Ferd. Nækius. Inest de Sardanapali Epigrammatis disputatio. Lips. 1817. 8vo. pagg. vi. + 290.

Ὁμήρου Ἰλιάδος Ῥαψωδία β' μετ' ἐξηγήσεων παλαιῶν καὶ νέων. Ἐκδοσις Βολισσία. Paris. 1817. pagg. μδ' + 154. (The editor is said to be the learned Dr. Coray.)

Θαλάσσιος Νομοθεσία, συναθροισμένη ἀπὸ διαφόρους νομοθέτας θαλασσίους Εὐρωπαϊκοὺς, καὶ πλουτισμένη ἀπὸ διαφόρους φυλαττομένας συνηθείας, διὰ ὁδηγίαν κάθε εἶδους ναυτικοῦ καὶ ἐμπορικοῦ; παρὰ καπετάν Νικ. Κεφαλαῖ, ἐκ νήσου Ζακύνθου. Ἐν Βιέννῃ, τῆς Α. 1817. 8vo.

Ὁδηγία Θαλάσσιος θεωρητικῇ καὶ πρακτικῇ, συναθροισμένη ἀπὸ διαφόρους ἐπιστήμονας συγγραφεῖς θαλασσίους, καὶ πλουτισμένη με διαφόρους εἰδήσεις, παρὰ τοῦ θαλασσοπόρου καπετάν Νικ. Κεφαλαῖ. Ἐν Βιέννῃ. 1817. 8vo.

(These two works are not of the classical kind; but we give the titles of them, because it is interesting to know the scientific progress of this classical people, the Greeks.)

Considérations générales sur l'évaluation des Monnaies Grecques & Romaines, et sur la valeur de l'or et de l'argent avant la découverte de l'Amérique; par M. Le Tronne. Paris. 4to. pagg. viii. + 144.

Prospectus of an edition of LEO DIACONUS, a Byzantine Historian hitherto unpublished.

THE history of Leo Diaconus is an important supplement to the collection of Byzantine Historians. Father Combefis had accordingly meditated an edition,* and even put it to the press,** but died before he could execute his project; so that Leo's work is still unpublished. It is preserved among the manuscripts of the King's library at Paris, and comprises the history of the reigns of Romanus the younger, Nicephorus Phocas, and John Zimisces (A. D. 959-975). It gives many details relating to the war which Swatoslaus, Grand-Duke of Russia, carried on against the Greeks about the year 971.

The munificence of H. E. Count ROMANZOFF, Grand-Chancellor of Russia, and the immediate patronage of the French government, have enabled M. HASE, professor of Modern Greek at the *Ecole spéciale et Royale des langues Orientales* at Paris, to undertake the publication of Leo's history. The book is nearly printed. It will form one volume, which will also contain philological and explanatory notes, and the following inedited works;

1. A treatise on Tactics, composed by order of the Emperor Nicephorus Phocas. (***)

(*) Si quando pace lenius aspirante.—Regia Lupara historiae Byzantinae pane necessario supplemento, cum Leone Diacono et Michaële Psello, regium vere multiplici titulo argumentum, juris publici regia munificentia faciat. Combefis. notis ad auctarium noviss. Bibliothecæ Græcor. Patr. I. 545. B.

(**) Quæ Leo Diaconus refert in historia, cujus pars typis Regiis jam edita est. Le Quien Orient. Christian. I. 255. D.

(***) See Fabricii Biblioth. græc. edit. Harles. VII. 677. C.

2. A fragment of the history of Joannes Epiphaniensis on the wars of the Persians and Romans, from a Vatican manuscript. (*)

3. The Greek text of the letter of Theodosius Grammaticus on the taking of Syracuse by the Saracens, published, but only in a Latin translation, by Pirro (**) and Ducange. (***)

The volume will be printed at the Royal press at Paris, and will make about 300 pages in folio, in two columns, one containing the Greek text, and the other a Latin translation. The size, the type, and most of the vignettes, will be the same as in the former volumes of the Byzantine Historians. Some new vignettes will exhibit inedited relievos and gems, relating to the history of Constantinople.

The price of the volume, which completes the Byzantine collection, will be 44 francs, or 40 francs to subscribers, to be paid on receiving the book. The whole will be printed by the end of 1817.

Subscriptions taken in by Messrs. de Bure, Booksellers to the King, and to the King's library, Paris, Rue Serpente, No. 7. Treuttel and Wurtz, Paris, Rue de Bourbon No. 18, and No. 30, Soho Square, London.

N. B. The Postage of Letters must be paid.

A Neat Edition of the GREEK SEPTUAGINT, in one Volume 8vo., the Text is taken from the Oxford Edition of Bos. It may be had in 2 Volumes if preferred. Price 1l. 5s.

CORNELIUS NEPOS; with English Notes and Questions. By the Rev. C. BRADLEY, M. A. Price 3s. 6d. bound.

The NICOMACHEAN ETHICS, the RHETORIC, and the POETIC, of ARISTOTLE, translated by Mr. THOMAS TAYLOR. 2 Vols. 8vo. 18s. bds.

A Concise GRAMMAR of the ROMANIC, or MODERN GREEK LANGUAGE, with PHRASES, and DIALOGUES on the most familiar subjects, compiled by Dr. ROBERTSON, after a residence of some years in the Ionian Islands. Price 4s. 6d. 12mo. bds.

CREUZER of Heidelberg has published a German correspondence, which passed between him and HERMANN, respecting the mythology of Homer and Hesiod. Both men ranking so deservedly high on the continent, and both being notorious antagonists of Voss, this little Opusculum will excite much interest among the foreign scholars.

Nouveaux extraits des *Vies de Plutarque*. Texte Grec, suivi d'un Vocabulaire donnant le sens de tous les mots qui y sont contenus; Par C. A. F. FREMION. Paris 1817. 12mo. pag. 84.

Σιβύλλης Λόγος ιδ. Sibyllæ Liber XIV. editore et interprete

(*) Commonly called Joannes Antiochenus. See *Notices & Extraits de MSS. Vol. 8. p. 259. n. (2.)*

(**) *Sicilia Sacra, T. I. p. 613-7.*

(***) *Ad Zonara Annales, II. 87-93.*

Ang. MAIO. Additur sextus liber et pars octavi cum multa vocum et versuum varietate. Mediolani 1817. 8vo. pagg. 56.

A Brief Outline of an examination of the *Song of Solomon*: in which many beautiful Prophecies contained in that Inspired Book of Holy Scripture are considered and explained with remarks, critical and expository. By William DAVIDSON, Esq. 8vo. Pr. 12s.

NOTES TO CORRESPONDENTS.

We shall give in our next Col. Leake's list of Greek Proverbs, as appended to his *Researches in Greece*.

Mr. M.'s Essay on Pastoral Poets, in our next.

Professor Dunbar's Treatise on the particle *ἐν* is postponed to No. 33.

Mr. J.'s Series of papers to prove that Philo and Josephus are Christian writers, will have an early insertion. Also his papers on the Greek Tragedians—and papers on Biblical Criticism.

H. T.'s *Ode in obitum Carolettæ Augustæ* contains many good lines; but we would recommend to his consideration the rules for Alcaics, given in the 22d and some subsequent Nos. of the *Classical Journal*. The perusal of those rules would have obviated the objections, which we are obliged to make to his verses.

Mr. D.'s learned and ingenious letters on the Cornish dialect, and on collateral subjects, will be duly honored.

L'article de C. N. sera mis à la tête du No. prochain. Un accident en a jusqu'ici empêché l'impression.

ERRATUM.

No. XXIX. p. 180. l. 26. read ἀριστοτόκειος.

THIS DAY IS PUBLISHED,

In Octavo, with the Plates separate in Folio, 1l. 8s.

TOPOGRAPHY

ILLUSTRATIVE OF THE BATTLE OF PLATÆA;

Consisting of Plans of the Plain and City of Plataea, of Plans of Eleuthera, Ænoe, and Phyle, and a View of Eleuthera, from Drawings made on the spot, by T. ALLASON, and engraved by COOKE.

ACCOMPANIED BY MEMOIRS

Read to the Academy of Inscriptions and Belles Lettres of the Institute of France.

BY JOHN SPENCER STANHOPE, F. R. S.

And Acad. Inscript. and Bell. Lett. Instit. Paris Corresp.

Printed for JOHN MURRAY, Albemarle Street.

INDEX

TO VOLS. XV. AND XVI.

A.

ACCENTS of the Greek New Testament, By Pasor, xv. 39
Account of the studies pursued at Cambridge, xvi. 1
Admonita locorum, a Latin Poem, xv. 364
Adversaria Literaria, xv. 131, 362. xvi. 183. 405
Egyptus, Cambridge Tripos, xvi. 291
Ælian, emendations on, xv. 359
Age of the Vestals, xv. 200
Aggar, meaning of the word, xv. 198
Ajax of Sophocles, emendations on the, xv. 368.
Alcaic Metres, xv. 105, 221. xvi. 49
An aliquid violentum sit diuturnum?—an *detur* in naturâ rerum absoluta quies?—*quicquid recipitur ad modum recipientis, recipiatur?*—*quicquid recipitur, ad modum recipientis recipiatur?* xv. 362, 363
Alchoder, xv. 13—fictitious history of, xvi. 88
Algebra, whether it was known to the Egyptians, xvi. 155
Alta vox, xv. 145
Anacreon quoted, xv. 105. xvi. 225
Andronicus Rhodius quoted, xvi. 304
Angerianus quoted, xv. 61
Anka, a fabulous Arabian bird, xvi. 91
Annales Encyclopédiques, announcement of the, xv. 380
Annius Viterbensis, account of his forgeries, xvi. 131. 140
Anted, antekâc, remarks on the words, xv. 346
Ἀνθέω, primitive meaning of the word, xv. 299
Antipater, Epigram by, xv. 28

Aphridun, xv. 13—fictitious history of xvi. 89
Apocrypha, books of the, xvi. 123
Apollonius quoted, xvi. 166
Appian quoted, xvi. 323
Arabian forgery, xv. 279
Ara Vestæ, xv. 129
Arcadius Grammaticus MSS., xv. 165, 310
Arches, use of, known among the ancients, xvi. 184
Archidamus, xv. 297
Archilochus, fragments of, xv. 216. xvi. 223
Arist. Quintilianus quoted, xvi. 101
Aristophanes, comments on, xv. 286. xvi. 33
Aristotle quoted, xv. 23. xvi. 345—vindicated, xvi. 7, 290—Ode of, xvi. 308
Arrian's Periplus, xv. 317
 ——— inscription on the tomb of, xvi. 404
Article definite, in the Egyptian language, xv. 3
Athenæus quoted, xv. 31, 34
Atrium Vestæ, xv. 262
Attonitus, in Juvenal, xv. 20
Audax, sense of the word, xv. 145
Augustinus, Anton. quoted, xvi. 140
Authenticity of a verse in Homer, xvi. 186

B.

Baul-hamon, meaning of the word, xv. 192

Bacon examined and criticised, xvi. 12, 288
Bailey's, I., discovery in Hieroglyphics, xvi. 319
Bangnaalim, meaning of the word, xv. 200
Barbarous words, use of, objected to in *Bacon*, xvi. 293
Barrows of the Troad, xvi. 66
Barthélemy quoted, xv. 252
Bennet Langton's Greek Letter, xv. 375
Bentley, Dr., quoted, xvi. 123—letter to *G. Richter*, xv. 171
Bernardin de St. Pierre, quoted, xv. 89
Bible Society, account of the progress of the, xvi. 194
Bibliotheca Classica, announcement of the, xvi. 197
Bodæus, quoted, xv. 35
Bodley's, Sir Thomas, Letter to *Bacon*, xvi. 13
Boldness of expression, xv. 61
Bolingbroke, Lord, quoted, xvi. 288
Bonus, malus, applied to bodily strength, xv. 24
Bowyer, quoted, xv. 305
 ———'s notes on *Callimachus*, xvi. 165
Bröndstedt quoted, xv. 303
Brucker, quoted, xvi. 280
Buchanan, Dr., quoted, xv. 90
Burney, Dr., quoted, xv. 146

C.

Cæsura, on the ancient, xv. 95
Callimachus, Notes on, xvi. 165
Cambridge, examination for a University Scholarship, xvi. 180—Prize Poem, xvi. 167—Tripos, (1789) xv. 83—Tripos, (1803) xvi. 291—University, xvi. 1, 314
Carthage, history of, xv. 116
Casaubon, quoted, xv. 35
Caspian gates, xv. 259
Catalogue of books published at Leipzig fair, extract from the, xv. 376. xvi. 185
Catullus' and Sappho's Rhythms compared, xv. 107
Cauldron of Kêd, xv. 93
Chaldæan oracles, xvi. 333
Chatterton, xvi. 137
Chevalier's crossing the Scamander, xvi. 57
Chinese writing, xvi. 22
Chrysostom, St., quoted, xvi. 167
Church, the, compared to a garden, xv. 193

Cicero quoted, xv. 93, 212
Circumlocutions frequent in *Juvenal*, xv. 19
Claudian quoted, xvi. 166
Climax of Love, xv. 214
Comments on *Aristophanes*, xv. 286. xvi. 33
Conjecture on *Tweddell's* Epigram, xv. 368
Corrections in the Translation of the New Testament, xvi. 274
Cottonian Manuscripts, account of the, xvi. 214
Cowley quoted, xvi. 300
Cowper quoted, xvi. 355
Croix, De Ste. quoted, xv. 120
Curiosities found in the ruins of *Pompeii*, xv. 305
Cyriologic Hieroglyphic, xvi. 317

D.

Dulzel, M., quoted, xvi. 57
Definitions of motion, by *Aristotle* and *Bacon*, xvi. 7
 ——— of the Epigram, by *Owen* and *Johnson*, xv. 212
Demon of *Socrates*, controversy on the, xv. 205. xvi. 166
Derivation of *Antea, Postea, Interea, &c.* xv. 346
Deviations of *Phædrus* from certain rules of versification, xvi. 83
Δικαιωσις, meaning of the word, xvi. 31
Diodorus Siculus quoted, xvi. 207
 ———, Remarks on some passages of, xv. 372
Dio Cassius quoted, xv. 266
Diomedes Grammaticus quoted, xv. 101
Dionysius Halicarnassæus, xv. 125. 263
Dissertation on the hieroglyphic characters, xvi. 313.
Distances, how measured by the ancients, xvi. 263
Druids, researches on the, xvi. 207
Duties of the Vestals, xv. 264

E.

Edda quoted, xv. 91
Elements of the Metric Doctrine by *Prof. Hermann*, xv. 79
Elcusinian mysteries, xv. 117
Elisions in Latin Poetry, xvi. 353
Elocution, boldness of, xv. 71

English translation from Timocreon, xv. 313
 ——— Epigram, in the manner of the ancient Greek Epigram, xv. 215
Ἐντελέχεια, meaning of the word, xvi. 8.
Epigram, ancient, xv. 212
 ——— by Latomus, xvi. 186
 ——— by Ménage, xvi. 185
 ——— Greek and Latin, xvi. 178
Epilogue to the Eunuchus, xv. 159
Epitaph on Dr. Vincent, xvi. 200
 ——— on Timocreon, xv. 315
Esoteric Worship, xv. 120
Etymology of the word adulari xv. 147
Euhemerus, system of, xv. 117
Euripides quoted, xvi. 182
Eustathius quoted, xv. 33
Exremond, St., quoted, xvi. 283
Explanatory remarks on the Song of Solomon, xv. 189

F.

Fables, new, of Phædrus, xvi. 88
Facciolati quoted, xv. 347
Færnus' attempt to construe, in a more elegant metre, a fable of Phædrus, xvi. 77
Figures, boldness of, in Horace, xv. 72
Fischer quoted, xv. 305
Fleet of Xerxes, xv. 296
Flight, of Hector, xvi. 70
Florus Christianus quoted, xv. 32
Fontal fathers in the Chaldaic Doctrine, xvi. 336
Forcellinus quoted, xv. 148
Force, true, of the middle Verb, xv. 304
Forgeries, account of Literary, xvi. 123
Fortune of Carthage, xv. 115
Foster quoted, xv. 97
Fragmentis, de, Poëtarum minorum Græcorum, xv. 216

G.

Gail's, M., various publications, xv. 176
Gaisford quoted, xv. 105
Gajado, H., xvi. 141
Gelasius, decree of the Pope, against the Apocryphal Books, xvi. 132
Gellius, A., quoted, xv. 260
Gell's, Sir Wm., Itinerary of the Mo-rea, xv. 156
Geography, ancient, xvi. 257

Gianni, an Italian Improvisatore, xv. 250
Γράβιον, meaning of the word, xv. 34
Greek accents of the New Testament by Pasor, xv. 39
 ——— and Latin Epigrams, xv. 317. xvi. 178
 ——— constructions, in Horace, xv. 78
 ——— Epigram, xv. 212
 ——— Epigram, by J. Tweddell, xv. 180
 ——— Letter, by Bennet Langton, xv. 375
 ——— Lines of J. Scaliger, xv. 367
 ——— Lines, a translation from Shakspeare, xvi. 178
 ——— Poem on hunting, xv. 237
 ——— Sapphic Ode, xv. 315
Greeks, Improvisation among the, xvi. 96
 ———, superiority of the, in arts and sciences, xvi. 145
Grove-Worship, xv. 88
Gryphiadaa, Greek Hexameters, xv. 237
Gwarchanau, xvi. 207

H.

Hafez quoted, xv. 94
Hamilton, Count, quoted, xvi. 285
Hannibal's remarkable exclamation, xv. 116
Hardouin quoted, xvi. 143
Harleianus Codex, xv. 14, 292. xvi. 119, 309
Heber, M., quoted, xv. 205. xvi. 161
Hebrew Criticism, xv. 189
Heinsius, D., quoted, xv. 61
Henoch called Esdras, xv. 12
Henry the Fifth's invocation to Sleep, in Shakspeare, translated into Greek verse, xvi. 178
Hermes Trismegistus, works of, xvi. 124
Hermocrates of Syracuse, xv. 297
Herodotus quoted, xv. 6, 90, 256, 298
Heroes of Ossian, xvi. 348
Hesiod quoted, xvi. 300
Heyne, Prof., quoted, xv. 335. xvi. 58
Hieroglyphics, Egyptian, xvi. 313
Historian, the character of Plutarch as an, xvi. 281
Histycus quoted, xv. 297
Holy-days, xv. 368
Homeric and Icelandic Poetry, xv. 352
 ——— Descriptions, xv. 326. xvi.

Homer's knowledge of human nature, xv. 298. xvi. 345
Horace, happy boldness of, xv. 61
 —, Observations on Ode 29.
 Book 3. of, xvi. 383
 —, strict and accurate versification of, xv. 224. xvi. 55
 — quoted, xvi. 225
Huetius, Bp., quoted, xv. 97
Horsley quoted, xv. 65
Hyde quoted, xvi. 94
Hyrokeryx, xv. 121

I.

Iambic metre of Phædrus, xvi. 74
Images, boldness of, in Horace, xv. 68
Improvisation among the ancients, xv. 249. xvi. 96, 357
Incisio, xv. 102
Induction, reasoning by, xvi. 303
Inghiramius, C., xvi. 139
Inscriptions, fictitious, xvi. 138
 — found in the ruins of Pompeii, xv. 322, 324
 — of the Diocletian column at Alexandria, xv. 161
 — Roman, at Tarragona, xvi. 397
 — Orchomenian, xvi. 402
 — on the tomb of Arrian, xvi. 404
Iol debellata, a Latin Ode, xvi. 175
Italian Improvisatori, xv. 249

J.

Jamee quoted, xv. 94
Jerusalem, an English Poem, xvi. 167
Juvenal, remarks on, xv. 18

K.

Keedar, meaning of the word, xv. 195
Kuster, whether, first discovered the true force of the middle Verb, xv. 304

L.

Lansdowne Manuscripts, account of the, xvi. 214
Latin Distichs, xv. 368. xvi. 186
 — lines on the death of Savonarola, xvi. 185
 — Ode, xvi. 175

Latin Poem on the Mathematicians, xv. 86
 — Poem on the violation of St. Denys' tombs, xvi. 43
Latomus, Epigram by, xvi. 186
Laurentius Toscanus, Epitaph of, xvi. 185
Leake's, Col., reply to a French note inserted in the Class. Journ., xv. 161
Lenep quoted and opposed, xv. 304
Letter, Critical, of E. H. Barker, to Th. Gaisford, xv. 216. xvi. 217
 — of Bentley, R., to G. Richter, xv. 171
 —, latin, of Boissonade to Barker, xv. 311—of Gail (J. B.) to the Ed. on the city of Olympia, xvi. 201
Libraries of Oxford and Cambridge, xvi. 5
Literary forgeries, xvi. 123
 — Intelligence, xvi. 410
Livy, emendations on, xv. 368—observations on, xv. 115 — quoted, xv. 21, 263. xvi. 237
Longevity of men of letters, xv. 207
Longinus quoted, xv. 61
Lots, divination by, xvi. 207
Lucan quoted, xv. 67. 73
Lucian, some passages of, explained, xv. 151. xvi. 232—quoted, xvi. 167
Lyric Verses, Latin, by J. B. xv. 365

M.

Machinery of Ossian's Poems, xvi. 350
Macrobius quoted, xv. 124. xvi. 217
Mallet, M. quoted, xvi. 286
Manihanae Lectiones, xv. 171
Martial, inventor of the Modern Epigrammatic Style, xv. 213
Marullus quoted, xv. 68
Measures, ancient and modern, xvi. 264
Memoir, Extract of a, relative to the Translation of the Scriptures, xvi. 194
Menage, Epigram by, xvi. 185
Men of Letters, Longevity of, xv. 207
Mercurialis Prolusio, xvi. 224
Metallic mirrors used by the Greeks, xvi. 152
Metrical lines contained in Latin and Greek Prose, xv. 181. xvi. 354
Metrical Doctrine, xv. 80
Middle Verb, xv. 304
Milton, falsely accused of Plagiarism, xvi. 135

Modern opinions concerning the Troad, xv. 326. xvi. 57
Mohammedes, a Latin Poem, xv. 344
Moses, Remarks on the Introductory Chapters of, xvi. 278
Motion, Ideas of Aristotle and Bacon concerning, xvi. 7. 15
Müller quoted, xv. 168
Niretus quoted, xv. 64
Musæus, Pseudonymous Works of, xvi. 126
Mutilation of the statues of *Hermes*, xv. 296
Myth of *Bacchus*, xv. 119
Mythological persons in the Egyptian Idolatry, xv. 29
Mythological Miscellany on *Mercury* and his functions, xvi. 224
Myrrian Archæology, Lines extracted from the, and commented on, xvi. 212

N.

Nonnus quoted, xv. 121
Nubere, Remarks on the word, xv. 149
Nunnesius quoted, xv. 29

O.

Odyssæa Collatio, xv. 292. xvi. 119, 309
Olympia, whether it ever existed as a city, xvi. 201
Oracles, Collection of the Chaldæan, xvi. 333
 — of *Zoroaster*, xvi. 338
Orchomenian Inscription, xvi. 402
Ordeal, xv. 368
Oriental learning, xvi. 146
Orpheus Fragments of, xvi. 217
 — Poems attributed to, xvi. 125
Ossian's Poems, xvi. 136
 — Temora, critique on, xvi. 344
Ovid quoted, xv. 22. 38. 65. 74. 94. 124. 212. 259. xvi. 228. 321

P.

Palm-tree, xv. 2
Πάρυπος, quantity of, xv. 28
Parallelisms between ancient and modern writers, xv. 300
Pasigraphy, history of, xvi. 22

Patricius quoted, xvi. 125
Pausanias quoted, xvi. 210
Percy, Lady, quoted, xvi. 9
Perionius quoted, xvi. 11
Peutingian Table, xvi. 257
Phædrus, Metres of, xvi. 74
 —, new fables of, xv. 121
φάρδος, sense of the word, xv. 30
Phegnamagike, meaning of the word, xv. 199
Philetæ, xv. 216
Philologic Researches, xvi. 109. 275
Philologue, announcement of the, xvi. 192
Phœnix, Researches on the, xv. 1. xvi. 38
Photius, an important passage of, corrected, xvi. 398
Phrynicius quoted, xv. 29
Pindarus, xv. 65
Plato quoted, xv. 299. xvi. 102. 163
Pliny quoted, xv. 87. xvi. 206
Plotinus quoted, xvi. 280
Plutarch quoted, xv. 128. 257. 265 xvi. 97. 322
 — Character of, as an historian, xvi. 278
Poetical argumentations, xv. 362
 — improvisation among the ancient Greeks, xv. 249. xvi. 96.
 — pride, xv. 64—
Poetry, force and respect of, in ancient Greece, xvi. 100
Poetry of Bacon, xvi. 307
Polytheism, whether the Gods of, were considered as men Deified, xv. 117
Pompeii, xv. 320
Pope, The, and the *flamen Jovis*, xvi. 352
Pope quoted, xvi. 183. 300
Porphyrius quoted, xvi. 12
Port-Royal Grammar quoted, xv. 98
Postea, Posteaquàm, Posthac, Postillà, Remarks on the words, xv. 346
Priscian quoted, xv. 104
Privileges of the Vestals, xv. 266. xvi. 321
Prize-Poems, xvi. 167.
Prizes awarded by the French Academy, xvi. 201.
 — the University of Cambridge, xvi. 4. 315
Prologue to the *Eunuchus*, xv. 158
Psellus, the Chaldaic Dogmas exposed by, xvi. 335
Puerility, Plutarch reproached with, xvi. 286
Punishment of the Vestals, xvi. 325

Q.

- Quadragesimalia Carmina* xv. 366
Quantity, Variation of, among the Latin Poets, xvi. 352
Quintilian quoted, xv. 61. 97

R.

- Racine*, Lines of, translated into Greek Verse, xvi. 356
Pare and new expressions used by Horace, xv. 77
Reid (Dr.) quoted and opposed, xvi. 12. 295
Rennel quoted, xvi. 62
Reply of a Frenchman to M. Boyd's articles, concerning some verses of Voltaire and Racine, xv. 361. — to Colonel Leake, on the Inscription of the Diocletian column at Alexandria, xv. 374. — Scævola, xv. 368
Researches made in the ruins of Pompeii xv. 320
Resemblance of Ossian's Temora to the greatest Epic Poems, xvi. 344
Revenue of the Thracian Kings, xv. 297
Rhapsodists, antiquity of, xvi. 359
Rivalship between Oxford and Cambridge, xvi. 5
Rivers of the Troad, xvi. 57
Roberts, Mr. Answer to a Correspondent of the Class. Jour. xvi. 272
Roch, a fabulous bird, xvi. 91
Rowley, T. Poems attributed to, xvi. 136
Ruins of Pompeii, xv. 320
Russian Bible-Society, xvi. 195

S.

- Sale* of Count M'Carthy's Library, xv. 220
Sepphic metres, xv. 105. 221. xvi. 49
Sappho, emendations of the Poems of, xv. 157
Saonarola, I. Latin Lines on the Death of, xvi. 185
Scaliger, Greek lines by, xv. 367
Schecorah, meaning of the word. xv. 194
Schmid's J. M. Pasigraphy, xvi. 27
Schneider quoted, xv. 361
Schweighauser quoted, xv. 33

- Science* of the Egyptians and Chaldeans, xvi. 148. 262
Scholarship Examination for a Cambridge, xvi. 280
Scriptures Sacred, xvi. 194
Seatonian Prize-poem, xv. 269
Secundus, Johannes quoted, xv. 67
Sensual views ascribed to the Song of Solomon, xv. 190
Searca the Philosopher quoted, xv. 61. 216
Serrins Grammaticus quoted, xv. 34. 101
Shaarreeke, meaning of the word, xv. 197
Shakspeare's Invocation to Sleep translated into Greek, xvi. 178
Shipwreck of St. Paul, an English Poem, xv. 269
Simile, Remarks on a, of Homer, xvi. 183
Similarity of Worship, in different parts of the Pagan world, xv. 88. 205
Simonides, fragments of, xvi. 218
Simurgh; a Persian bird, xvi. 94
Skapheion, meaning of the word, xv. 130
Σωχέρης, in Plutarch: a false reading, for σωφάνης, xv. 311
Socrates, whether he actually affirmed that he received advice from a spiritual and supernatural being, xv. 205. xvi. 160
Sodalitates, xv. 147
Solinus quoted, xv. 7
Song of Solomon, Remarks and Explanations on the, xv. 189
Sophocles quoted, xv. 299
Sotadean Verse, xv. 112
Sothic year, xv. 8
Spondaic Verses, xvi. 353
Suetonius quoted, xvi. 325
Stanley's Notes on Callimachus, xvi. 165
Statius quoted, xvi. 226
Statues of Marsyas, xv. 300
Stillingfleet, Bp. xvi. 123
Suicide, The, a translation from V. Bourne, xv. 366
Superiority of the ancients, xvi. 6
Superstition, ancient, xv. 123. xvi. 206
Sura quoted, xvi. 208
Symbolic Hieroglyphic, xvi. 317

T.

- Table* of Prosody, for the Alcaic metre, xvi. 51

Table on the ancient measures, relative to the English foot, xvi. 267
Tacitus quoted, xv. 7. 89. 92. xvi. 211
Tarragona, Roman inscription at, xvi. 397
Teenor's Treatise on omens, xvi. 209
Telescopes Conjecture on the antiquity of their invention, xvi. 151
Temple, Sir W. quoted, xvi. 6
Testament, Corrections in the common translation of the new, xvi. 274
Th (English) pronounced by the Icelanders, xv. 296
Thebes, a well-regulated city, xv. 299.
Theognis, fragments of, xv. 220. xvi. 217. 224
Thot, Books of, xvi. 150
Timocreon's Poetical, Gastronomic, and Pngilistic abilities, xv. 314
Tomb of Ilus, xvi. 68
Translation of Arrian's *Periplus*, controversy on the, xv. 317
Translations in Greek verse, xvi. 356
Trial by Ordeal, xv. 366
Troad, criticism of modern opinions concerning the, xv. 326
Tropic Hieroglyphic, xvi. 317
Tweddell John, early attempt of in Greek verse, xv. 180
Tweddell, xv. 368
Tyrwhitt quoted, xv. 99

U.

University of Cambridge, xvi. 1. 180
Usurpation, which took place between the reigns of Cambyses and Darius, xv. 300

V.

Valerius Flaccus quoted, xv. 38
Varrerius quoted, xvi. 142

Venacrah, meaning of the word, xv. 195
Versification, ancient, xv. 96
Vestals, Observations on the, xv. 257. xvi. 321
Vesta, whether she represented the comforts of a Domestic life, xv. 124
Festa, Worship of, xv. 123. 257. xvi. 321
Figlius, Epitaph of, xv. 367
Filloison, De, quoted, xv. 122
Findication of M. Clavier's character, xv. 334
Violation of the tombs at *St. Denis*, Latin Poem on the, xvi. 43
Virgil quoted, xv. 124

W.

Wagner quoted, xv. 220
Walekenar on ancient Geography, xvi. 257
Wallis, Dr. quoted, xv. 146
Words omitted by H. Stephens, xv. 166.—xvi. 31

X.

Xenophon quoted, xvi. 162.—announcement of, published by M. Gail, xv. 175

Y.

Yatana; a Chinese bird, xvi. 90
Yereckayilke, meaning of the word, xvi. 201

Z.

Zoroaster, Oracles of, xvi. 338



P
L4C1
C

CLASSICAL JOURNAL

v. 16
(1817)

PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE
CARDS OR SLIPS FROM THIS POCKET

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO LIBRARY
